The Equality of all People before God and its relationship to social democracy.

Reflections on the present and hopes for the future.

By Wilhelm Spark

1907

Friedrich Funcke Publishing House

Freiburg im Breisgau

All rights reserved.

Printed by Karl Rohm in Lorch (Württemberg.)

This paper is an attempt to outline the origins and some of the effects of the equality phrase and to address a burning issue of the day from a still little-known perspective. This little work makes no claim to completeness; it should be judged by what is given, not what is missing.

Only the law can give us freedom.
Goethe.

Remarks.

At all times there have been slogans which the masses have blindly clung to for lack of clear concepts, especially when they flattered their base instincts. They usually had a short life; they seized the people and carried them away for a few years and decades, then they disappeared in the maelstrom of time.

This cannot be said of a single one, of the so often used and abused phrase of the equality of all people before God. Yes, it is certainly a true phrase if one uses it correctly, if one speaks of the immortal in man, of the soul as the divine spark which comes from God and returns to him after a varied life on earth. But the unfortunate thing is that this

phrase of democratic stupidity has always been applied to things to which it can never be appropriate. To apply it to any kind of equality requires a great deal of thoughtlessness.

Equality, especially political equality, has been the subject of bitter struggles for decades, in which one side strives to achieve the object just as fiercely as the other believes it must stubbornly refuse it. In the bitterness between the parties, a purely objective treatment of the disputed subject has all too often been ignored, which asks first of all whether the opponents have the same concept of it, whether the goal can be achieved at all, and what consequences and implications equality has for practice. It could be that concept and word do not coincide, that the goal can only be achieved in part, and that any continuation of the struggle beyond this would be accompanied by the gravest disadvantage for culture.

In a time of progressive democratization of society, it may seem a hopeless undertaking if I dare to shake up a position that has acquired citizenship through tradition, and has even been sanctified to a certain extent by incorrectly interpreted passages of holy scripture.

Why swim against the current, one might ask, when it is so convenient to let oneself be carried along by it? Those who speak like this are not wrong. But it will become clear in the course of the presentation that even the trees of democracy do not grow to the sky, and it does not seem entirely pointless to me in this paper (which, as I expressly emphasize, is not intended to serve any party in any way) to subject the question of whether and to what extent the saying about the equality of all people before God is correct to a fundamental investigation and analysis, using facts from history.

I do not recall having found anything in the literature that has investigated this idea to the very bottom and, if it has proved untenable, has emphatically opposed it. Men like Chamberlain and Treitschke still pay homage to it, which may not be meant seriously but is at least symptomatic. Chamberlain says: "Before God, all people, indeed all beings, may be equal, but the divine law of the individual is to preserve and defend

his own individuality."[1] And Treitschke says: "Even if one assumes that humans descend from a couple, and no matter how convinced one is of the equality of all people before God, the differentiation of species lies an infinite time behind us."[2]

Much evil, much bitterness could have been avoided by clarifying the situation. We see in the course of history how little good it is when the ignorant mob, incited by the babble of unclear minds, presumes to demand equal rights with the best of the nation. For the latter only knows about rights, but knows no duties.

Historical.

The ancient Germanic tribes did not know the phrase equality, which would also have been inappropriate for the social division of nobles, freemen and slaves. Their community was made up of two, or if you like, three classes: a noble class from which the princes were chosen, and free peasants. Tacitus says that the Germanic tribes chose kings according to their nobility, i.e. the more noble a family was, the better its prospects were. Alongside both classes and under them in strict subservience, although not harshly treated, stood the slaves. An Old Norse report describes the origin and purpose of these three social classes: "The slaves had a strange, ugly physique, equally low in their thoughts as in their actions, dark-skinned, with fat fingers, a gluttonous face, and a bent back. Then the free man with a striated beard, a clear forehead and a tight-fitting dress. Finally the noble man, the Jarl, has light curls and shining eyes, eyes as sharp as lurking snakes; for it is primarily by the eyes that one recognizes a man of high birth."[3]

The Germanic people, who had the inequality of people before their eyes every day, could not possibly have come up with the idea that the natural order of things would suddenly be abolished in the afterlife, which they thought of as merely a better continuation of the present, that all differences would be blurred there, and so, without being afflicted by an unhealthy humanity, they transferred their earthly views of human

1 Foundations of the 19th century I. 17.
2 Politics I. 268.
3 Weber: World History V. 670.

worth to the afterlife, in that, in their opinion, only noble and free men, but above all the warrior who had fallen in battle, had access to Valhalla's blessed hall, while unfree men and cowards had to descend into the unfriendly underworld, where "the god Thor, who has his plague everywhere, was busy with their accommodation."[4]

Gobineau calls this original race with its ugly, strange physical structure the Finns[5] - not to be confused with today's Finns, A. Wirth[6] speaks of Turanians or Alarodians, other anthropologists use other names. Whatever the case, it is certain that this original race existed in Europe and that it was at a very low level of culture. Spring accuses them of cannibalism with good reason.[7] This claim has been disputed, but hardly with justification, since there is no reason to assume that cannibalism is restricted to black people. We know for certain that the Celts indulged in it[8], cannibalism is also mentioned in the *leges barbarorum*, i.e. in the time of the migration of peoples[9], and old chronicles report cases of cannibalism from the Thirty Years' War.

The original race has not died out, but has mixed with the Aryan races of the Celts and Germanic tribes and lives on atavistically in the urban proletariat, among whom one sometimes finds types that seem almost pre-scientific, especially in southern German cities.

And the spirit of the original race is not dead either, but rather raises its head more threateningly than ever.

Regarding the difference between "Aryan" and "un-Aryan", H. A. Graevell says: "Aryan is distinguished, noble, chivalrous, heroic, loyal and pure; The plebeian spirit, the shopkeeper spirit, the crude philistinism, the "comfortable" philistinism, moral cowardice, the hedonism, the egotism. The sense of the metaphysical background, of the absolute, the eternal, and therefore also of the ideal, is deeply rooted in Aryanism. The un-Aryan spirit is a positive spirit that does not brood and reflect, to which all

4 Weber: V. 670.
5 Gobineau: Inequality of the Human Races III. 132.
6 Wirth: The Turanians of the Near East and Europe. Supplement to the Allg. Ztg. 1904. No. 287/88.
7 Gobineau III. 143.
8 Grupp: Culture of the Celts and Germanic tribes 21.
9 Kurth: Origins of Europe. vol. I

philosophizing seems pointless, that takes the world as it is, "comes to terms" with it and is content with it.

"The Aryan is the hero, the man of the original race of the Philistines. The Aryan believes in God, the non-Aryan only in gods. For the lectern, there exist only individual forces, so to speak, whose connection remains forever unclear to him. The Aryan, however, sees through the connection and thus attains unity. The more Aryan a person is, the closer he comes to unity, he becomes what Schopenhauer called the "genius". The non-Aryans do not achieve genius. They are too attached to the earth for that."[10]

The simple circumstances of the Nordic peoples therefore offer no evidence for the origin of the dogma of equality on Germanic soil. It was brought to us with Christianity.

Since Christianity has its roots in Judaism, we are interested here in the position of the Jewish people on the question of equality, so that we can learn about the disposition, the spiritual disposition of those who have handed down the words of Christ to us in the Gospels.

At the time of Christ, the Jews had lost their national independence. Many lived in dispersion, and as is often the case with oppressed peoples, they nurtured revolutionary ideas. Mommsen calls the Jews the ferment of disintegration because of their rioting in the Roman Empire, a term which is still perfectly applicable to the Jews of today, for if one excludes Bebel and the unsuccessful Baron von Vollmar, the leadership of the German subversive Social Democracy is exclusively in Jewish hands.

The Palestinian Jewry was internally under the rule of the Sadducees and the Pharisees, of whom the former formed a kind of priestly aristocracy, and it needs no special assurance that the arrogant Pharisees did not even think of making themselves equal to the people. Since the Pharisees demanded strict fulfillment of the law, which was practically unattainable for the mass of the people, they wanted to realize this ideal at least in their narrow circle and thus, in their view, they formed the normal Israel in

10 Graevell: Aryavarta 3rd Academic Publishing House, 1905.

contrast to the mass of the people, who lagged far behind their output.[11]

The fact that the Jews considered themselves the chosen people allowed them to be as democratic as necessary among themselves and in earthly affairs, but this belief absolutely excludes equality before God. Otherwise Christ would not have had to tell them the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, which can be seen as the main bearer of the dogma of equality, with its stupefying effect on the priesthood.

But is the interpretation of this parable correct?

The difficulties in answering this question begin with the text of the Gospels. The evangelists did not write as strict historians, but as believers, missionaries, enthusiasts. They wrote down what they liked and how they liked it and how they understood it. The edifying, the blessed was the object of their enthusiasm, not simply reality. They did not cling anxiously to words. They left out what they felt, because it could not have been true, could not be the gospel, could not be good news. On the other hand, they linked loosely circulating sayings together where it seemed necessary to create a tolerable whole, or they even invented the situation in which a valuable word from the Lord could have been spoken. This is not to say that they lacked a sense of truth; but they proceeded in the oriental manner, their truth was subjective.[12]

Thus, the text itself gives cause for concern. But let us stick to what is given for the time being. As the parable of the workers in the vineyard (Matthew 19) is presented to us, the simple mind cannot help but give it the familiar interpretation. Chamberlain also interprets it this way in his great work when he says that the almost exclusive emphasis on the moral nature of people and their equality before God ("the Lects will be the first") form the cornerstones of Christ's personality", whereby he presents this basic view of Christ as morally belonging to Judaism.[13]

The higher view understands equality before God in the sense of an unchangeable justice that is beyond all doubt, which does not spare even the most noble sinner, which

11 Riehm: Dictionary of Biblical Antiquity, article Sadducees and Pharisees.
12 Jülicher: The Parables of Jesus. I. 4.
13 Chamberlain: Foundations I. 248.

treats rich and poor, high and low with equal severity and shows no respect for persons. We do not need to concern ourselves with this reasonable, but unfortunately rarer, view here. But there is also a vulgar one that draws unlawful conclusions from equality before God.

The main mistake that is made when considering and interpreting the Bible passages in question and other passages, knowingly or unknowingly, with or without intention, is that one always touches on the worldly area, and it is clear that not everything always goes smoothly here. One is bound to come to false conclusions, especially when human desires play a role. It is an undoubted fact that very few people, completely detached from the ego, are capable of judging something purely objectively, especially when party passion is involved, which tends to stifle every noble and distinguished feeling among the masses.

Given the great importance of Christ for our culture, one cannot be too careful in drawing conclusions which, if justified, would brand Christ as a politician and deprive the image of the noble Nazarene of much of its dignity. We can see that such a danger exists in those social democrats who brazenly claim that Christ is one of their own because they see in the Lord's statement about the "two coats" a confirmation of their communist principle, when in fact it is only an invitation to do good clothed in a vivid image.

The parable of the workers in the vineyard has been interpreted just as superficially as this word, and a deeper penetration into the meaning of the parable produces a result that is as far removed from the popular understanding as possible. Christ did not want to proclaim equality, but rather he wanted to say that one should not forget goodness in the name of justice. Jülicher explains it like this:

By giving the first hired workers the agreed wages, the master of the house fulfills his duty to them; by paying an equally high wage to those who came later, he does more than his duty; he not only gives what is fair, but in free kindness gives away some of his property to poor wage workers. But no one may demand gifts, so those who have only

received their due may not complain because they have not been given gifts too. Goodness can exist alongside justice, and actually only envy, not an imaginary fanaticism for justice, can reproach goodness when it acts according to its free will.

The point of view of the master of the house is unassailable. If he had given the last more than the first, we would find his behavior questionable; if he had also given the first more than agreed, we would be happy about it. But since we do not have to decide how we would proceed in such a case, we can only say: the master of the house is in the right despite the grumbling of some of the workers; he has shown kindness and not violated justice; he has fulfilled his duty more strictly and made use of his right in favor of poor fellow human beings. There can be little doubt as to what Jesus meant. "What the righteous receive out of duty as a well-deserved reward for their piety, God gives to repentant sinners out of free grace; he can do with his property as he pleases within the limits of justice, and by their coming and their penance, even if only at a late hour, those poor people prove themselves worthy of his grace, so that there can be no talk of a foolish squandering of great goods. The God who has only one salvation in store for all the children of men, for the high priests and elders, as well as for tax collectors and prostitutes, does not deserve blame, which only miserable envy could find the courage to do, but rather grateful recognition, whether for the justice with which he keeps his promises to those who have kept his commandments, or for the goodness with which he rewards far beyond merit and worthiness, paying rewards where almost only hours, years, or lifelong idleness could have been blamed or punished."[14]

Unfortunately, this beautiful explanation comes a little late. It also remains unclear why the Lord chose such a difficult-to-understand form for the simple teaching, one that almost invites misunderstandings, when he could have given the application in clear words. Did Matthew perhaps only hear the final words and then freely and easily add the rest? Or was the chosen form necessary in order to be able to absorb an even deeper meaning?

14 The Parables of Jesus. II. 465.

First of all, it is enough to have established that the parable can be fully and satisfactorily explained in the Christian sense, without having to infer a dogma about the conditions in the afterlife or absolute equality. This is contrasted by other statements by Jesus which leave no doubt that the idea of "everyone like the other" was completely alien to him.[15]

In the writings of the Gnostics we also find a good, perhaps the best, explanation of the infamous saying "the first will be the Lects", which, however, does not contribute in the slightest to strengthening the dogma of equality.

In the so-called Pistis Sophia writing, a conversation between Mary and the Master is reported. Mary asks:

"Master! Will the people of this world, who received the secret of light from you, stand above the emanations of the light shake in your kingdom?"

In response, the Master explains the order, nature and activity of these great emanations, all of which will occupy a higher place in his kingdom at the end of time, when the Aeon is complete and the Pleroma has swung out. But this time has not yet arrived. But the people who have received the secret of light will stand higher than all and have precedence over all.

And Mary says:

"Master, the light that dwells in me has ears, and I understand every word that you say. Now, oh Master, concerning the word that you have spoken, namely: "All human souls who receive the secret of the light will have precedence in the inheritance of light over the rulers who will repent, and over those who are righteous and over all from the kingdom of pleasure;" concerning this word you told us earlier: "The first shall be the Lects and the Lects the first." The Lects are the entire human race who will be the first in the kingdom of light, for they are the first to dwell in the spaces of the heights."[16]

The Gnostics were imaginative Greek religious philosophers - if one does not define this term too narrowly - who sought to unite knowledge and religion. They

15 Jülich: Parables II.
16 Mead: Fragments of a Lost Faith. 388.

emphasized above all the ethical side of Christianity and lived a strictly ascetic life themselves. They kept their teachings secret in order to protect them from desecration by unqualified and unworthy people. For them, Christianity was not only religion, but also science and cosmogony; Christ was not only the "Son of God" who became man, but also, like the "Father", a cosmic power. In a similar way, other expressions of the second article of faith, such as "only-begotten - virgin - crucifixion - death - burial - descent into hell - resurrection - ascension" had partly mystical, partly symbolic meanings. The coarse, unpolished mind of the Roman half-breeds, unable to follow the bold flight of the Gnostic imagination, materialized these expressions, added some of the history and teaching of Jesus, and from this mixture formed the Apostles' Creed, which thus proves in its essential parts to be a tremendous misunderstanding of the Gnostic terminology. Can the conscience of our clergy be burdened any longer with this misunderstanding?

The connection and identification of cosmic and spiritual forces made the Gnostic systems very complicated. There were numerous powerful beings in the afterlife, all of whom had special tasks to fulfill: angels, archangels, archons (rulers), aeons, powers of fate, virgins of light and other mysterious beings, mysteries in various orders and degrees. The attempts of the Gnostics to describe the conditions seen in their visions were necessarily flawed, because it is extremely difficult to grasp and reproduce conditions in the supersensible world with the means of knowledge of the sensory world. This must be taken into account when the descriptions of the Gnostics seem confused and incomprehensible.

The conversation between Mary and the Master is about the things of the earth. Dr. C. Schmidt gives the following explanation of the text: "The possessors of the mystery of the Ineffabilis [Ineffable] occupy the highest rank, and through this they gain insight into the reason and purpose of creation, into the origin of all things and into the great God-world process; they become equal to the first and unite themselves with the members of the Ineffabilis[17]. In this way they have raised themselves to what they are

17 "You enter into Brahma," the Indians would say.

according to their original nature, to a creation of the Ineffabilis, to a being of the same height as him, just as all beings, including humans, originally emerged from the primal principle itself and thus are of one and the same substance with him..... The possessor of this mystery, although he is still in the cosmos, stands higher than all angelic powers[18]; He and Christ form a mystical unity, for "the one is I and I am the other"; the other is king in his kingdom and will be seen to the right and to the left of him. Among all, the disciples of Jesus, his companions and his brothers, who are in possession of these highest mysteries, stand out, for their throne will be closest to that of Jesus, and above all that of Mary and John, the virgin. - The souls of those who have been saved by the grace of the believers also take part in this ascension of souls. They have either not received the mysteries or have committed sins, but have escaped the torments of the archons of the middle and the underworld through the possessors of the highest mystery, have received a special seal from the Virgins of Light and have been baptized and anointed by the Virgins of Light; but since this does not in any way qualify them for entry into the Kingdom of Heaven, entitled, they are gathered into the treasure of light in a special place until the "exit" of the universe takes place. As soon as the curtains of the treasure of light are then drawn up, those seven Light Virgins cleanse and purify those souls once again, give them the Mysteries again and place them in the final order of the treasure of light.

"In this way, Jesus' saying has been wonderfully fulfilled that the last will be first and the first will be last. For humanity came into being significantly later than the Archons and the higher world of light. Only after the chosen race had received eternal bliss did the hour of their redemption strike, while until then they were bound to their place and active in the service of the light."[19]

Thus we have three interpretations of Christ's words: the simple plebeian, the learned theological and the mystical of the Gnostics. Since we must always assume the

18 We encounter a similar thought among Buddhists: "A saint who follows the path of salvation is above all gods" because the gods are already created as such and have no merit in their divinity, while the saint must laboriously attain his perfection.

19 C. Schmidt: Gnostic writings in Coptic. 534. Leipzig 1892.

more reasonable of such an important personality as Christ, it is not difficult to reject the first interpretation as absolutely untenable. Which of the other two one chooses depends on personal inclination, since it is impossible to determine with certainty the context in which the word was spoken. On the basis of the Gospel of John and some obscure passages in the Synoptics, we may assume that Christ was knowledgeable about the mysteries[20], that the word was spoken with mystical meaning in the narrow circle of disciples, and was later taken up by Matthew and supplemented with fabulating. This assumption has much to be said, for in Luke (13:30) it appears in a parable which, when interpreted allegorically, comes close to the interpretation of the Gnostics. However, for the purpose of this writing, it is less important what Christ said or how he wanted his words to be understood than how they must not be understood, if all reason is not to be violated.

Although we cannot hold Christ responsible for the abuse that has been made of his words, it cannot be denied that his conduct and his teachings have a democratizing tendency. The people are extremely sensitive to this, they immediately feel when a teaching speaks in their favor and they have put this to the test more than once.

The picture we can form of Christ is in any case incomplete. We do not know to what extent the evangelists were reliable in their reporting of their stories and to what extent they did not follow a tendency in one direction or the other, nor do we know what was omitted, inserted or misunderstood. Biblical criticism has certainly cleared up many obscurities, but it cannot do the impossible job of bringing back characteristic, forgotten sayings of the Lord, which might perhaps show him in a completely new light. So we must take the gospels as they are. They show us Christ as the irreconcilable opponent of the arrogant Pharisees, as a despiser of wealth and as a mild, kind, ever helpful friend of the poor, who also associates with the lowly and despised and even praises them above others in the Sermon on the Mount. How could this not work on the imagination and

20 In addition to the excellent work by Mead mentioned above, see: Steiner: Christianity as a Mystical Fact; Besant: Esoteric Christianity; du Prel: The Mysticism of the Ancient Greeks. These writings remove any doubt that Christianity has its roots in the Egyptian-Greek mysteries. That is why such an enigmatic, unfathomable darkness hovers over its origins, which puts the ingenuity of the best researchers to shame.

awaken in the minds of minors the alarming idea that stupidity has the upper hand in heaven! People simply lack the concept of quality; they do not know that condescension is not brotherhood; they are incapable of measuring the enormous distance between themselves and the intellectual princes, if they are even aware of it, according to the old saying: the less intelligence a person has, the less he notices the lack.

None of the truly great men from Buddha to Goethe was ever democratic. Christ was not either, and it is only due to a combination of peculiar circumstances that he came across as such. His teachings were much less popular with the rich, who were entirely concerned with their own interests and had no time to worry about their spiritual well-being, than with the poor, who were less burdened by material pleasures, and so it is only natural that his contacts tended in this direction. It never occurred to him to present poverty and narrow-mindedness as meritorious in themselves. He only turned against wealth because it inhibits the soul's outreach to the divine.

A learned Japanese says of Christ: "I confess that, without being able to explain it, I feel a difference between the love which Christ teaches and the benevolence and goodness which Bushido[21] never ceases to demand. Is it in their inner character? Is it in the degree of their strength? Is it because one is democratic and the other aristocratic?"[22]

I quote this passage to convey the impression that Christ and his teachings make on people who have not lived in our circle of thought since their youth. Just as we Christians first notice the weaknesses in other religions, educated non-Christians also immediately notice the weak sides of our faith. We must not blame them for this; it is human nature to seek out other people's faults, and we are rarely as ruthlessly impartial towards ourselves as we are towards others.

For the sake of completeness, it should also be noted that attempts have also been made to squeeze the equality of all people and all debts before God out of the parable of the two debtors.[23]

---

21 Bushido, the moral doctrine of the Japanese samurai (warrior caste).
22 Our Fatherland Japan. A source book written by Japanese. 248.
23 Jülicher: The Parables of Jesus II. 294.

The second source of the dogma of equality is Paul.

Paul did more than any other apostle to spread Christianity, but through a strange combination of circumstances he also added elements to it that were incompatible with the pure doctrine of the Nazarene cannot really be united.

In early Christianity, two trends were evident from the beginning: the Jewish Christianity of the original apostles in the regions of Judea and the communities of Gentile Christians in Asia Minor and Greece formed by Paul. The opposing views of the Jews and the Gentile Christians led to endless battles, which only led to a compromise towards the end of the first century, when the two trends agreed on a legal, works-based version of Christianity, which developed into Catholicism.

The Jewish Christians were Jews by religion and descent, kept the law like them and differed from their fellow countrymen only by their belief in Jesus as the promised Messiah. Paul, on the other hand, proclaimed a Christianity free of legalism; the law had become invalid through the sacrificial death of Christ, and salvation was only achieved through faith: "We therefore conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from works" (Rom. 3:28). And while the stricter party of Jewish Christians demanded circumcision and thus submission to the Jewish law as a condition for admission into the Messiah community, Paul emphasized all the more strongly that nationality was completely irrelevant for Christians and that even Jewish Christians were not obliged to observe the law.[24]

Because of the proselytizing that was flourishing at the time, Paul feared for the survival of the communities he had founded, so that in order to strengthen their faith he wrote those letters which so unambiguously proclaimed equality before God as far as Christianity was concerned.

He wrote to the Romans: There is no distinction between Jew and Greek; there is one Lord of all, rich over all who call on him (Rom. 10:12).

To the Corinthians: For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether

24 Hilgenfeld: Judaism and Jewish Christianity; The Heretic History of Early Christianity. Riehm: Dictionary of Biblical Antiquity.

Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or free, and we have all been given the same Spirit to drink (I Cor. 12:13).

To the Galatians: There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ (Gal. 3:28).

To the Colossians: There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision, uncircumcision, non-Greek, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ in all (Col. 3:11).

Thus, by force of circumstances, Paul became the creator of the principle of internationality; the opposition to Jewish Christianity forced him to do so. If he preached salvation through faith, then the law was superfluous, then its followers no longer had any privileges, and the equality of peoples before God arose quite automatically. The distinction between classes also disappeared: here there is neither slave nor free.

What Paul understood by faith is a purely theological question and is not of concern to us here; what is certain is that for him it was an inner experience and more than just believing it to be true.

While it is true that equality before God can only be applied to the religious sphere, in that salvation in Christianity should be accessible to all people without distinction of race or status, it is on the other hand an indisputable fact that far-reaching conclusions can and have been drawn from this doctrine for worldly matters. If all people are equal before the just God, the highest authority, then equality in earthly matters is also a self-evident commandment of fairness and all inequality is evil. This conclusion is illogical and brutal, because the restriction that equality only applies to the religious sphere is not made, but it is very convincing on the outside; it is a partial and apparent truth that has grown into a dogma that poisons healthy thinking and tyrannically controls minds.

The worst effect in this respect was and is the fact that the religious shimmer surrounding the dogma makes it inviolable, so to speak; that it is taught in schools, approved by the Church, democratizes even the young and creates a secret undercurrent

without being noticed[25], the effect of which, however, comes to light in a thousand different ways. People are amazed at the crazy efforts to achieve equality, fight them with the most impossible means, but do not think of tracking down the hidden origin of the disease.

It is characteristic that social democracy and materialism, which have long since deposed and retired God, nevertheless devoutly revere the dogma of equality, thus clinging to a conclusion whose premise they deny.

The democratic element of Christianity seems to have been effective from an early stage and to have promoted the spread of this religion. "In particular, all the weary and burdened, the poor and the unfree, the slaves and the freedmen embraced with fervor a religion that gave them back the human rights denied to them by paganism, promised them equality before God and before the law and, through the doctrine of freedom and brotherly love and community of all, assigned them a more dignified position in civil society"[26].

Anyone who has the slightest doubt about the egalitarian tendency of Christianity can learn from the Acts of the Apostles about the fundamental communist character of the first Christian communities. Even later Greek philosophers discussed this aspect of Christianity, but without finding recognition for it, since religious prejudice still glorifies and exalts the life of the first Christians today. Our social democrats, on the other hand, are bitterly criticized for their communism. The reasons that motivate the early Christian and social democratic communists are of different kinds, but that is irrelevant in view of the fundamental question: does Christianity have democratic elements or not? The answer to this question must be a resounding yes; there is no escape from it.

People like to go back to the origins. That is all well and good, but then one should also have the courage to reach into a hornet's nest with a firm hand if necessary

25 No less a person than Goethe said (to Eckermann) that man cannot get rid of the impressions of his youth. When this great man, whose mind was so rich in profound impressions of the most varied kinds, complains: what can we expect from the poor devil who gets through life with perhaps a dozen ideas that he picked up in his youth, including the idea of equality?

26 Weber: World History IV. 406.

and not avoid the consequences that result from uncovering an unexpected truth. The origins of Christianity and the questions about the personality of Jesus are such a hornet's nest.

With commendable courage, Kalthoff lets Christianity emerge from the consciousness of the times.[27] This is certainly going too far, but it is certain that this consciousness of the times influenced the formation of the documents of Christianity, and there is therefore nothing to prevent the assumption that the word about the first and the last reflects less the Lord's view than the reflection of the democratic age.

The sooner we free ourselves of this burden of the past and shape Christianity according to the demands of the present - which we are just as entitled to do as the evangelists - the better for us and our descendants. We have a duty towards readers to follow better knowledge.

I confess that Kalthoff's radical approach, which seeks to completely eliminate a Christ who is crumbling under criticism and thereby make room for something new, strikes me as more sympathetic than the approach of many theologians, for whom Christ is only the buttocks into which, in the absence of any historical certainty, they pour everything that they themselves carry in their hearts. This Christ has become an involuntary Proteus. One only has to compare the many writings that have appeared about Christ and the familiar mill wheel in one's head begins to turn. Hopeless confusion. -

When Christianity became the state religion under Constantine and thereby lost in inner value what it gained in external power - as soon as it came to power, it exercised the sad office of revenge on the heathens. The clergy took advantage of the people's ignorance and soon condemned them to complete passivity. They made it difficult to read the Bible and only gave the people Christianity to the extent that the "national chaos" (Chamberlain) could understand it. This policy had the effect that the democratizing tendency of this religion was little known for many centuries. This can be

27 2) Kalthoff: The Christ Problem. The Origin of Christianity.

concluded from the sudden flare-up of passions when the teachings of the Reformation opened the eyes of the peasants who had been so badly abused by a depraved nobility and a clergy that was no better than them.

[Missing page 23 to 26)

to ignore the material. The enormous influence of race on the fate of nations is admittedly admitted, even if opinions on details often differ widely. It is hard to pick up a better newspaper that does not touch on or discuss some racial issue, and if developments continue in this way, the twentieth century, after the stultifying and noble-minded obsession with equality reached its peak in the nineteenth century, will make a clean separation between the elements that are still mixed up today.

Only the Social Democrats and their related groups continue to proclaim the equality of all people on principle, for do we not hear it in the Reichstag beating and singing and chanting: "Here is no German, no Russian, no Chinese, no Herero, here is neither Jew nor non-Jew! We are all one - freedom, equality, fraternity!"

Equality.

When Disraeli opposed Gladstone's parliamentary reforms in 1866, which were intended to give the vote to a wider range of citizens - a reform which he himself carried out a year later - he described the consequences that the law would have: "For as soon as you have universal suffrage, it always happens that the voter looks down on the member of parliament. He says to himself, "I am just as good as he is, and if I send him to Parliament, I think no better of him than of myself." Then, when the House of Commons is entirely without power over the Executive, it will sink to the level of those popular chambers of the Continent which we have seen rise and fall in our own day. The charm of tradition, the charm of history will be wanting; no family of historic name, none of the great landlords around whom men flock when liberty is threatened; no

statesmanship, no eloquence, no learning, no genius. Instead you will have a horde of selfish and obscure mediocrities, capable of doing nothing but mischief, and the plan and direction of the mischief will belong to the raging demagogue of the day."[28]

The former English Prime Minister could not have expressed the misery of today's parliamentarism more forcefully. The picture is drawn from life. In the "raging demagogue" the characteristics of a well-known German mob leader are anticipated with exhilarating fidelity; the scenes of brawling and beating in the Austrian and French parliaments, where people no longer try to convince each other by the force of their arguments but by the force of their fists, fully justify the term "horde", and to what extent the "mediocrity" is to be seen as an innuendo against our Reichstag is something that the reader can consider. Incidentally, a serious brawl also took place recently in the Japanese parliament, as a sign that the Yellows, who are eagerly imitating the achievements of Europe, have properly understood the essence of parliamentarism.

In remarkable agreement with the harsh judgment of the liberal Englishman is a statement by the reactionary Pobedonostsev which again confirms that the extremes are in contact. In his work "Controversial Issues of the Present" he says: "If a true definition of the word parliament were required, one would have to say that parliament is an institution which serves to satisfy the personal ambition, pride and personal interests of its members."[29] The talkative Duma has hastened to agree with him.

National circles of the German people have never really enjoyed the Reichstag. Even in its younger years, when interest was still lively and the waves of political life were high, it was unable to free itself from the most petty politics of interests, hollow doctrinaireism, the most boring hair-splitting and chicken-coop-like party squabbles. This has not improved since then, and in fact the indifference of the representatives to their office has also become a problem. The Reichstag squandered its reputation so thoroughly that it became the laughing stock of decent people and was treated with due disdain by the government. In order to put an end to this undignified state of affairs and,

28 Plehn: Constitutional Changes in England. Prussian Yearbooks 1904. Vol. 116.
29 Graevell : Aryavarta 6.

above all, to remedy the chronic inability to make decisions, it demanded attendance allowances, and unfortunately, due to a mistake on the part of the government, received them in such a form that one might as well speak of absence allowances, because a representative who skips all his meetings still gets a thousand Marks in payment.

In principle there is nothing wrong with allowances, but one cannot expect them to improve parliamentary conditions. Quality can never be replaced by quantity. It makes no difference whether there are 397 mediocre members present instead of 100, who say yes or no on the orders of the party chief. Strictly speaking, the Reichstag without allowances, with an average of 100 members present, was still higher than the paid Reichstag with 397 members will probably ever be, if one does not allow oneself to be blinded by the number, because those 100 made sacrifices for their office, they were concerned with the cause, a certain idealism was unmistakable, whereas with the new Reich mercenaries one never knows where self-interest ends and duty begins. Now that the Reichstag mill has been given new momentum by a plentiful supply of the desired material, it remains to be seen whether it will clatter less, but produce better flour.

In all the discussions that preceded the granting of allowances, one fact was, to my knowledge, overlooked, namely that those deputies who so steadfastly stayed away from the proceedings of the "High House" knew without exception before the election that they could not or would not fulfill their duty. None of these tribunes, however, was so decent as to draw the conclusion from their failure to do so and resign their mandate in order to make way for someone more worthy; hardly any of them thought that the political passions at the election had not been unleashed for the purpose of giving them the opportunity to flaunt a meaningless mandate in childish vanity. Either accept the mandate and exercise it, or leave it alone - the choice was not difficult. The Reichstag could have had the allowances long ago if it had mustered the courage to make a manly either/or decision. The fact that it did not do so, but begged for allowances in a disgraceful manner, is a sad proof of how far the vast majority of its members still have a right to a truly noble conception of parliamentarism. The least that can be expected of

the Reichsbote is a lively, clear sense of duty, and they have not yet met this requirement.

But it can hardly be otherwise with an electoral law which not only puts genius on the same level as fools, but also allows every selfish and obscure "mediocre" to vote on the well-being and woe of many millions, regardless of whether they are aware of the significance of their decisions or not. It is taken for granted that every profession requires lengthy training and education, but it is also taken for granted, strangely enough, that the difficult office of a legislator does not require any preparation. Now the certificate of competence for parliamentarians is yet to be invented, but until then one should be concerned that those called to the Reichstag are also chosen ones who, through their spirit and character, guarantee beneficial work for the good of the country.

The antidote to the defects inherent in the Reichstag does not lie in the abolition of universal suffrage, as is openly and secretly desired by various parties, but rather, apart from its desirable transformation into a parliament of the estates, graded according to the quality of the professions, in the merger of the state parliaments of the federal states. For however much mischief the short-sighted Reichstag would have caused in questions of foreign policy and especially national defense, had it had its way, it must not be forgotten that in domestic politics it forms a valuable safety valve, which prevents discontent from becoming excessive and takes the sting out of many a dissension when it can vent itself in the Reichstag through the mouths of the tribunes.

Extensive democratization of the individual state parliaments would be a great mistake, since it would slowly and imperceptibly but surely undermine the position of the princes and thus also of the Federal Council. The Federal Council has so far proved to be the firm bastion of the unity of the Reich, and any shaking of this foundation is dangerous, if not in the present, then at least for the future, given the destructive tendencies of the Reichstag. It is not impossible that in the future we will be glad to have reliable pillars of order and the Reich idea in the state parliaments. The impetuous desire of the Social Democrats to gain control of the individual state parliaments as well, in

order to undermine the Reich building from there, clearly shows the need to preserve the aristocratic character of these houses.

At present, the conquest of the Prussian Landtag is on the wish list of the Social Democrats, and it is unlikely to be removed from it any time soon, since it is an excellent means of agitation and the comrades need new bait.

Admittedly, the need for reform of the Prussian Landtag electoral law, which is entirely tailored to the plutocracy, is in need of reform, but there is no reason to exchange this extreme for an even worse one. There are many intermediate stages between the plutocratic and the universal equal right to vote.

What do the Social Democrats want in the Prussian Landtag? To pursue practical social policy? There are eighty of them and they have enough opportunity to do so in the Reichstag, especially since Reich laws take precedence over state laws, but nothing has been heard of fruitful actions to redeem the proletariat. Nevertheless, for political reasons, one should deprive the Social Democrats of this cheap means of agitation and, for reasons of equity, reform the Prussian electoral law while retaining the class system in such a way that the proletarians receive a certain number of seats, about a tenth, while the rest of the state's actual backbone, the broad middle class from farmers, craftsmen and civil servants to scholars and small capitalists, are given voting power to a much greater extent than before. The rights of millionaires can be vigorously curtailed in favor of the middle class and men of intelligence.

For the lowest strata of the population, who would probably only vote for Social Democrats, a tenth of the seats would be a participation that would be entirely in keeping with their intellectual importance. They could then put forward their wishes, could complain and criticize - as is well known, the comrades' wit does not extend any further than that without their foolish behavior endangering the existence of the state. Since the Social Democrats deliberately exclude themselves from all practical work and only work towards overthrow, they cannot complain if the bourgeois parties do not grant them more influence than they consider to be good.

A right of election within the limits indicated here would not be perfect - an ideal right of election will always remain a pious wish - but it would represent a great step forward compared to the current situation and would put a stop to the introduction of universal, equal voting rights for a long time to come by strengthening the middle class.

The Prussian right of election is now almost 60 years old; once tolerably appropriate to the circumstances, it has gradually become wrinkled and needs rejuvenation. Unfortunately, the prospects of this are extremely slim. It is always the fate of small minds, whom fate has accidentally raised to the heights of life, that they do not notice, or do not want to notice, the eternal flow of things and believe that the present state of things is unchangeable. So they fail to move with the times, until one day fate, in the form of mob whispers, comes breathing down their necks and takes away unbidden what they did not want to give voluntarily. The longer the reform of the Prussian electoral law is postponed, the more difficult it becomes and the greater the concessions that must be made, for appetite comes with eating, and while now it is still possible to give with good decency and discretion, later defeat is accompanied by ridicule.

The electoral reform cannot have the task of reconciling social democracy. That would be a false calculation, because the enemy is irreconcilable. Social democracy, which has freedom and equality written on its banner[30], can only be radical by its nature and only know one goal: power.

Theoretical social democracy is largely journalistic trickery. Its leaders depend on stirring up passions. What will they eat, what will they drink, what will they wear? The heavenly Father will not feed them if they do not marry the daughters of commercial councilors, do not cheat, lie, distort, collect workers' pennies, feed the gullible, uncritical masses with phrases and drive them into senseless strikes.

When reading the red press, one cannot help but get the impression that the old battle between Ormuzd and Ahriman, between light and darkness, has flared up among

30 "The Social Democratic Party of Germany is therefore not fighting for new class privileges and prerogatives, but for the abolition of class rule and of classes themselves and for equal rights and equal duties for all without distinction of sex and origin." Erfurt Programme

us in a new form, so one-sidedly is all good and all virtue attributed to the honest proletarians and all villainy to the wicked bourgeois. The worker, who reads the resounding phrases and the pompous stuff year after year in endless repetitions and variations, so that one involuntarily recalls the well-known, endless melody of Richard Wagner, is systematically blown up into a superman for whom the world with all its splendors was created, and it is only surprising that he has not long since gone where the party's wire-pullers would like him to go, to the barricade or to the bayonet, so that the blood shed can once again become dragon seed and provide material for new promises.

The social question, which is essentially of a religious and economic nature, is cleverly transferred by the leaders to the political sphere, because this is the only way to delay the solution to the problem for as long as one wants and to entertain the masses with promises of a great mess and the flawless future state that will be built afterwards.

The weak point of socialism is its lack of a program when it comes to practice. No bridge, however narrow, leads from the airy realm of utopia to the harsh reality. All we know about the famous future state is that everyone has to clean their own boots in it, everything else is just nonsense, and it is characteristic of the stupidity of the socialist herd that they let themselves be put off for so long with such a meager morsel and do not take the leaders at their word.

And the leaders who behave so pathetically and are so politely indignant when a comrade's hair is harmed, don't they realize what a great injustice they are committing when they let year after year pass without leading the proletarians, whom they cheat out of their hard-earned pennies, out of the land of slavery into the promised land of the future state? Or must we bourgeoisie lead the way here too? So be it!

It would not be a bad thing to give the leaders the opportunity to put their theory of the pure virtue state into practice, even without everything being torn to pieces first. For this purpose the government should provide them with a not too small area, perhaps 40-50 square miles, in our colonies, perhaps in East Africa, in a healthy, fertile highland, so that a few thousand comrades could establish there a healthy state in accordance with

their ideals, free from the rot of bourgeois society. Furthermore, they would have to be granted the funds necessary for the initial establishment - let us say 20-30 million marks - so that tools, livestock, food for the first few years can be procured and housing can be built.

East Africa is a plateau and, as recent research has shown, is entirely healthy and fertile internally, so the comrades have no objection to the location. However, it does not have to be East Africa. South American states, the Congo state and other countries would be happy to provide a suitable area for the settlement. In keeping with the international character of social democracy, the young free state would have to be placed under the control of the powers that would have to guarantee it independence for the first ten years. Likewise, all interference in the shaping of internal conditions would have to be strictly avoided. The comrades would have to remain entirely dependent on their own unfathomable wisdom. The prerequisite would, of course, be that the comrades do not simply copy bourgeois society, but strictly follow the program of equality. The introduction of free love on the broadest democratic basis is certainly expected, but for the first few years, in order to produce offspring with strong convictions, it would be advisable for the socialist females to be fertilized by comrades of proven "roughness". The matadors of the party will certainly be happy to devote their energies to the good cause and to use the parliamentary holidays for fruitful recreational trips to the paradise of equality. With strict adherence to the breeding principle, the perfect, rough, shaggy normal comrade could be achieved in just a few generations. The external leadership of the Free State could be entrusted to Mr. Bebel, who has long felt that it is a disruption of the moral order of the world that he cannot rule as Pasha or Reich Chancellor somewhere, and Mr. Mehring, as Minister of Culture, would do his bit to cultivate the true "sow herd tone".

Anyone who would object that such a huge sum should not be wasted on such daring experiments should remember that we have sacrificed hundreds of millions in honor in China and Africa and that it is only an act of justice if we see the comrades who

also contributed to those war costs in a position to create something completely new. We should not be narrow-minded in this regard; Germany is so wealthy that it can get over a few million, especially since part of the money would stay in the country.

The problem would soon become apparent. First of all, the comrades would have to show their colors. Instead of criticizing, they would themselves be exposed to criticism; the whole world would follow the course of events with excitement.

If the comrades reject the plan, which is very likely, they thereby admit their inability to do practical work, which can only be very welcome to us, since we will then not be wielding this weapon in vain. But if it finds their approval and is implemented, it will either succeed or fail. In the first case, if after a few decades there is utter happiness and contentment in the new society, if equality is maintained and the black and yellow comrades eat peacefully from the same bowl and enjoy the same rights as the white ones, a good deed will have been done and we would have good reason to reform our outdated civilization. Or the matter will fail; then the comrades will have made an immortal disgrace of themselves, the nebulous future state will be a thing of the past and the heinous demagogues will have been reduced to absurdity.

If the comrades claim that it is more sensible and better to take care of the oppressed at home than to move into the wilderness, the first answer to this is that social welfare should not be interrupted for this reason. It can continue to be carried out as it has been against the will of the Social Democrats and without their participation. But then it must be much easier for the comrades to bring the model state into being in the way indicated and free from the disturbing influences of the environment than to reform bourgeois society, which will face a thousandfold resistance to this undertaking.

Bebel once said that the Social Democrats live from the mistakes of their opponents. Well, then turn the tables. Force the Social Democrats to die of their helplessness. They will probably do that anyway, but we can help them a lot in doing so. Since it will not realize the future state of its own accord and will not unharness the parade horse that has been so splendidly pumped up, we want to meet it halfway and

invite it: *Here is Rhodes, jump here*. The future state must be transformed from an advertising tool into a threat for the comrades.

Just imagine how pleasant the leaders would be if a proposal were submitted to the Reichstag to approve an appropriate sum for the establishment of the future state. Not in the least prepared for the undertaking, indeed without even being clear about the basic principles, they would see themselves compelled to reject the proposal and thus vote against their own principles if they did not want to expose themselves badly in the implementation of the plan! But even if the comrades swallowed the bitter pill and went along with the joke and we had a few million to spend, the damage would still be on their side, because firstly we would regard the approved sum as a lost cause and secondly a disgraceful fiasco can be predicted with deadly certainty.

The enemy is most effectively defeated with his own weapons. If we want to fight the Social Democracy seriously, we must not shy away from making a few sacrifices. Much would be achieved if it were possible to shake the confidence of the masses in their leaders and the press. But nothing is more suitable for this than to expose them by exposing their incompetence.

With the apparently so reasonable demand for equal rights and equal duties for all, the Social Democracy has had great success with the masses, whose advocate it acts as, and will continue to have so as long as there are still unsatisfied wishes, i.e. always, provided that events do not occur or intellectual currents become effective which convince the dissatisfied of the untenability of their demands.

The Social Democracy admits that equal rights require equal duties, but it stubbornly forgets that both have the same talent for indispensable foresight - because the unequal talent is the rock against which the waves of the subversive high blood will break.

Approximate equality of talent is only found among wild or less civilized peoples. The more advanced a people, the greater the differences in the abilities of the individuals, differences which are sometimes colossal and cannot be compensated for by

any effort even at medium levels. Even the equal education dreamed of rather than strived for by the Social Democrats would be able to change little in this respect. At most it would allow a certain amount of knowledge and skills to be acquired in a certain time, but it would have to leave innate inclinations, drives and abilities largely unaffected. Man is no longer a blank slate when he enters the earthly stage. He brings with him certain characteristics which inevitably determine his fate.

The leaders of the Social Democrats are well aware of this fact, even if they are not suffering from acute egalitarianism. Their entire personal behavior shows that they are not at all inclined to act in accordance with their teachings, and as long as they still live in villas with a separate "entrance for gentlemen only," their sincerity may be seriously doubted.

Nothing more annoying can happen to the comrades themselves than when they are forced for some reason to put the beautiful theories into practice. Freedom, equality, how quickly they reveal their true face, and especially brotherhood. Wherever one gets an insight into social democratically run companies, they show the mistakes so mercilessly condemned in the bourgeoisie to a much greater extent. Not only are officials and workers generally paid much less than is usual among the wicked bourgeoisie, the companies themselves also have a worrying tendency to fail. But the six Forward editors who were suddenly dismissed because they allowed themselves to have their own opinions can already provide edifying testimony to the freedom of opinion that will prevail in the vaunted future state - not to mention the new kind of brotherhood that has become popular since the Dresden party congress.

The talk of equal duties is also foolish. Humanity would have to give up all progress if the same yardstick were to be applied here. The man of intellect and genius who works for humanity for centuries has qualitatively and quantitatively different expenses to meet than the idiot who looks out of his window into his neighbor's gutter and who fully fulfills his duty when he conscientiously fulfills the modest obligations of everyday life. How should the lower limit of duties be determined? And are there not

also religious, moral and artistic duties in addition to the political duties that social democracy has in mind?

There is only one reasonable basis for the distribution of rights and duties: To each his own! Even if it is not always completely feasible, since human passions thwart even the best intentions and all earthly circumstances are relative, it must nevertheless form the only basis for every just state and social order. -

As in the small and individual, so in the large and whole. If we look at the European states, which are considered to be the real bearers of civilization, we notice no less great differences both between the individual peoples themselves and between the groups of peoples united to form a nation. In the Latin countries, Switzerland, Germany and the Netherlands, the part of the population living in the north of these regions is the real backbone of the states, the part which supplies the most capable statesmen, the most able warriors and the best citizens. The reason for this is to be found in the immigration of the Germanic tribes into these countries from the north. England, which received the Germanic tribes from the south, and Scandinavia, on the other hand, have a fairly uniform population without the profound contrast between the north and the south, as is the case, for example, in Denmark. Italy, for example, has it, where the government is forced to hold trials against members of the Camorra and the Massia, as well as other major trials, in Lombardy cities, because judges and juries in the south are generally corruptible.

Apart from the fact that the Germanic peoples occupy the leading position among the peoples and are actually on the way to becoming masters of the globe, it is particularly noteworthy that the countries richest in Germanic elements have also retained an aristocratic nature for the longest time. The form of government is not so important here as the customs and attitude of the people. Despite the republican constitution, which pretends the opposite, Switzerland is much more aristocratic than Italy, which is ruled by a monarchy but eaten away by envy. The excesses of the dogma of equality here can be seen in a few anecdotes that provide better information about the

character of Italian democracy than dry observations. The famous Italian historian Guglielmo Ferero published an article in the Parisian newspaper Figaro about the Murri-Bonmartini trial, in which he attempted to prove that Linda Bonmartini, the daughter of Professor Augusto Murri, who was recently sentenced in Turin to ten years of hard labor for remote complicity in the murder of her husband, was the victim of a miscarriage of justice. Ferero wrote:[31]

I believe that no tragedy has occurred in Europe for a long time, as complicated, as exciting, as mysterious as the Murri trial, which recently ended before the Turin jury court.

Those who study the degeneration of democracies would search in vain for a more horrific phenomenon than this tremendous attack of collective madness, provoked by a mysterious crime and whose victim was a woman of high intellectual standing.

Pretty, extraordinarily intelligent and educated, of captivating charm, possessor of a considerable dowry, Miss Linda Murri, the daughter of the professor at the medical school in Bologna and of the most famous doctor in Italy, Mr. Augusto Murri, seemed to combine in herself all the requisites for a happy marriage. As misfortune would have it, she became a pitiful woman through her marriage to a young man from Padua, Francesco Bonmartini. Her husband came from a hereditarily troubled family in which there were numerous mentally ill people. He belonged to that category of people who appear normal on the outside, but whose mental disorder is revealed only to those closest to them. This became clear to Mrs. Linda Bonmartini when she recognized her husband's true character. She was a kind-hearted, noble, intelligent and artistic woman who had the noble ambition to make her husband a distinguished man, to improve the miserable situation of the peasants on his estates and to use part of their income for charitable purposes. He, on the other hand, was rude, suspicious, mean, and had only three passions: sensual pleasures, avarice and a bizarre vanity that was fed by his wealth, a vanity that contained the seeds of megalomania.

Physical and mental suffering put Mrs. Bonmartini on her sickbed. When she recovered, one day she met Dr. Secchi at a friend's house, a man for whom she had once felt a strong affection and whom she would have married if her family had not opposed it. Her husband knew about this little romance. With her usual honesty, she also told him that she had met Secchi again. This drove him into a real frenzy. He pursued her day and night with his suspicions and one day he even accused her tender love for her father of being an incestuous crime. Her marriage became a hell.

On the 28th or 29th of August, Tullio did indeed murder his brother-in-law. No sooner had

31 Munich N. News 1905 No. 421.

Tullio made a confession, no sooner had a Bologna newspaper reported that Mrs. Bonmartini had a lover, and that this lover was Dr. Secchi, than the public was thrown into a frenzy that bore no relation to the crime, however serious it was. Anyone who knows modern Italy will not be surprised at this fact. For the past six or seven years, certain bourgeois classes in Italy have been seized by a democratic obsession. They demand that from time to time some person of the higher classes be handed over to them as a sacrifice, in order to enforce the principle that the law shows no respect for persons. After forty-eight hours, millions of people were convinced that Mrs. Linda Bonmartini had had her husband murdered. Millions of people, in passionate greed, demanded her immediate arrest and accused the judiciary of not taking vigorous action because Linda Bonmartini was the daughter of the famous Professor Murri.

She was then arrested. One would have thought that this would have calmed the general excitement. The opposite happened. Unfortunately, for twelve years now a sensationalist press has developed in Italy which, like a raging torrent of slander, threatens to sweep away the finest traditions of the serious press. This press began a terrible campaign against the unfortunate woman. The most terrible slanders were spread against her and her father, who is one of the most honorable men in Italy. The circulation of these shameless scandal sheets grew unbelievably from day to day, while the serious papers, which did not want to deceive the public, were suspected of having been bribed by Professor Murri. The serious newspapers, seeing their circulation dwindle, had to give in: they did not invent novels, but contented themselves with repeating what the other newspapers had spread. Encouraged by this, the leaders of the slander campaign launched a new monstrosity.

After portraying Mrs Linda Bonmartini as a demon, a Messalina, a Lucrezia Borgia, they made her husband a saint, a martyr. But how does the character of a Messalina fit with the notorious fact that Mrs Linda Bonmartini used the savings from her toilet to support the poor and looked after the peasants on her husband's estate like a mother? The answer to this too was quick: she had been faking it all her life. And this general storm swept away the justice system too.

And so it came about that in the head of her brother Tullio, who loved her passionately, a terrible thought arose that would not leave him alone: the thought of freeing his sister from her executioner by murdering her husband.

One day the unfortunate woman stood before the jury of Turin like a prostitute, Linda, they called her pale and haggard, or rather, before the entire nation, which had turned into a gigantic jury. There was not a single piece of serious evidence against her. Noble ladies, former ministers, bishops, and distinguished citizens who appeared as witnesses praised the modesty, kindness, compassion, and charitable spirit of the accused, and declared that it was unthinkable that she had committed the crime

of which she was accused. It was all in vain. The masses wanted their sacrifice!

Nevertheless, six jurors had the courage, after the main question of incitement to murder had been resolved with seven no votes, to also deny the secondary question of remote complicity. Six yes and six no - that meant acquittal! This caused a furious rage throughout Italy. Acquit Linda! This is a disgrace for Turin! Those who voted no have been bribed! In the face of this storm, the President had to declare the first vote null and void and order the jury to deliberate again. One juror was weak enough to be intimidated. The second vote resulted in seven yes votes to five no votes. An hour later, the gendarmes took the unfortunate woman, who had collapsed unconscious, to prison.

Human justice believes that the poor woman will have to pay for her alleged crime for ten years. It is mistaken; the punishment will not last that long, for a god of mercy is already approaching the gates of her prison, breaking all the chains forged by human stupidity and cruelty: death.

After the Roman Court of Cassation rejected the appeal against the sentence, the King, in consideration of the poor health of the accused and in order to restore their mother to the children, commuted the sentence to exile, much to the annoyance of the Democrats, who were not very pleased with this expression of humanity on the part of their King.

For the ethnologist, this case is interesting in that it shows that the strengthening of democracy is undoubtedly connected with the overgrowth of the black blood that has been present in Italy since the Roman Empire, against which the constantly retreating Germanic element is increasingly unable to assert itself, which amounts to an increasing degeneration of the race and offers little hope for the future of Italy.

When the great Prussian king abolished torture in his states, he noted in the decree that it was better to let ten guilty people escape than to hang one innocent person. This view is still alive among the German people today. In Germany, the accused would undoubtedly have been acquitted and the verdict would have been received with approval. It is different in black Italy, where in the hands of the democratic fury the highest right becomes the highest wrong. This sharp contrast in the sense of justice creates a barrier between the two peoples that is higher than the Alps and makes a lasting alliance impossible. There is still a good chance of solidarity between peoples as long as such differences exist. Only those peoples can show solidarity who, by virtue of natural

affinity, essentially agree in their views.

The Murri-Bonmartini case only appears in the right light when one compares it with how those who so zealously defend equality before the law shamelessly ignore it as soon as their own dear person is in question. As is well known, the standing army with its street discipline is a terrible stumbling block for the Social Democrats, and they leave no stone unturned to introduce the spirit of division and disobedience through ruthless agitation. For this purpose, the Antimilitarist League was founded for France, Switzerland and Italy, and it has achieved considerable success in the way it stirs up trouble and incites. For example, the Italian deputy Todeschini, who as a representative of the people enjoys freedom of insults and slander, quite openly accused the Bersaglieri Lieutenant Trivulzio of murder and other outrages and, following famous examples, frivolously slandered the personal honor of his victim. After Trivulzio had his complete innocence established by a judicial investigation, he sued Todeschini for slander, and the latter was sentenced to ten months and 25 days in prison and a fine of 1,000 lire. When the Attorney General then asked Parliament for approval of the execution of the sentence - which caused the *Forward* to erupt in anger because one of his own was affected - an undignified comedy of delay began. The majority of the committee members who had to deal with the bill were constantly prevented from attending, perhaps out of cowardice, or because they thought that the same thing could happen to other deputies. Finally a rapporteur was appointed, but in the meantime the end of the chamber was approaching and the noble Todeschini disappeared abroad in time to reappear as an indispensable tribune of the people at the beginning of the new session. "A scandalous denial of justice in times of the vaunted equality before the law," wrote an Italian newspaper, "the army and members of the army can from now on be insulted and slandered with impunity, if the slanderer only Member of Parliament."[32]

Norway, which is generally regarded in Europe as a truly democratic country, is a pleasant contrast to Italy. This is wrong. Norway formally abolished the nobility in 1821,

32 Border Messenger 1906 No. 3.

but in reality the aristocracy of the landownership rules over an ancient peasant nobility, and it has a well-developed class system appropriate to its circumstances. The only difference is that both have developed in different forms to those known in the countries of the continent, and that the system of orders and titles plays only a very insignificant role. In the remote valleys of central Norway there are dozens of peasant families who boast that they can trace their origins back to the time of the Vikings. Among these long-established, influential families, which have established gradations of rank among themselves which are strictly observed, two stand out in particular through brilliant representatives: the Björnson family through the poet of the same name, and the Sars family, whose fame is currently embodied in Fritjof Nansen. They jealously guard their traditional reputation, as do peasants everywhere, and it is characteristic of Björnson's "core democratic" attitude that he has no intention of giving up the slightest of his inherited class privileges as a descendant of Harald Harfagre.

Now it is true that democracy does not necessarily exclude class and property privileges, and especially not the bourgeois one, which is why social democracy hates them no less fiercely than any other social order, but it is equally true that these privileges confer power and influence and seek to expand at the expense of others, which can go so far that democracy transforms itself into an aristocracy. This will always happen where great ethnic differences are ignored when democracy is established.

The Norwegians are a fairly homogeneous race, a circumstance which is always favorable to the existence of democracy. However, the democratic spirit would only prove itself if the Norwegians lived together with people of recognized inferiority, such as Negroes and Hottentots, and granted them the same political and social rights which they claim for themselves. But it is reasonable to doubt that they would put themselves on a brotherly footing with the colored people.

History shows how little power the Germanic tribes granted their princes. They were little more than the first among their own kind. No other relationship would have

been possible without great friction between men who considered themselves worthy enough to wield the princely spear themselves if necessary. But Norway is the country where Germanic customs and conditions have been preserved the longest, even if in a very weakened form, and a look into its past will help us understand the present. In any case, the calm Nordic democracy, which knows how to make revolutions so exemplary, should not be put on the same level as the wavering states of the Romanic peoples (not excluding France), which cannot escape scandals of all kinds, parliamentary mismanagement, corruption, upheavals and civil wars, and whose constant unrest shows that they have little right to exist. -

In no other country has democracy been able to develop so undisturbed, so free from foreign influences and so in accordance with its own laws as in North America. Everything that could have favored its prosperity was found here: a fertile, richly irrigated land inhabited only by a few savages, almost inexhaustible reserves above and below ground, the absence of any tradition, no feudalism, no tyranny of princes, so that the spirit of democracy had the opportunity to create its masterpiece. The external impression of American civilization is now also impressive; feverish activity, the accumulation of colossal wealth, highly developed technology, a higher standard of living than in the old world and great luxury allow "unlimited possibilities" to appear before the astonished eye. But the attentive observer, who is not put off by the incense that uncritical enthusiasts on both sides of the ocean of the young republic, soon sees the dark side of this civilization. The characteristic of American life is the hunt for the dollar, and profit is the highest ideal. America's free democrats lie in the dust worshiping "King Dollar". The passion for acquisition dominates everything and allows the flowers of noble humanity to unfold only with difficulty. Accordingly, the balance of American intellectual life is rather poor: second-rate statesmen and generals; no artist, no poet, no philosopher of outstanding importance; little for posterity, nothing for eternity.

In trade, which is not restricted by the barriers of tradition, the personal element of human interaction is almost completely suppressed; personal duties, class and

professional honor, politeness and morality count for little or nothing, at most that legality is maintained. "Being smart is everything." A terrible consequence of the unbridled drive for profit is public corruption, the extent of which one can hardly imagine in Europe. Public officials, representatives of the people, representatives of the trade unions can be bought and are happy to be bribed by interested parties to abuse their authority or their positions of trust. Just mention the underhandedness in the life insurance companies, the fraud of the New York police administration (Tammany) and the postal scandals. The Panama Canal, which was taken over by the French, required 80 million in "administrative costs" before work had even begun. The corruption is such that one expert claims that only a few of the great American fortunes were acquired without unpunished embezzlement of the law.[33]

These unpleasant phenomena are certainly partly due to the peculiar conditions of the American civil service. The so-called lifelong position of a civil servant in German terms is completely lacking in America. The civil servants of the states, cities, the federal government, in the administration, the judiciary, the post office, the clergy, the teachers, all of them are not permanently employed and cannot count on pensions for themselves or their widows and orphans. As commercial employees, engaged on a contractual basis and with the possibility of termination, they must have been at any moment exposed to the risk of losing their jobs and facing nothing[34]. In addition, there is the custom that every time there is a change of president, even if it does not mean a change of system, many officials have to vacate their positions, which are then filled by the new president's creatures - a bad habit which further worsens the insecure situation of the officials.

The American people, who jealously guard their sovereign rights and do not employ officials regularly so as not to give them too much self-confidence and to be

33 H. A. Fiedler: The population problem in the United States of North America. Prussian Yearbooks 1904, Vol. 115. Fiedler gets to the bottom of the matter by examining man, the creator, not the creature of circumstances. His strictly objective, impartial treatise provides better information about American conditions than extensive works whose authors cling to superficialities.

34 Fiedler, I. c.

able to remove those they do not like at any moment, are therefore - the other side of the coin - exposed to the dishonesty of these officials. And it is not surprising that in a country where everyone is madly chasing the dollar, officials also secretly join in this hunt in order to improve their precarious situation a little. Every country has the officials it deserves.

The exhausting struggle for existence cannot fail to have a detrimental effect on the health of the population. People are worn out terribly quickly; young old people, people of 30-40 years with snow-white hair are not rare in America, and no country, with the possible exception of Paris, has so many neuropaths.

A far worse disadvantage, however, is that the unbridled desire for profit results in a selection of the capable in an unfavorable sense, i.e. those individuals who are distinguished by their shrewdness and unscrupulousness in business dealings, who are willing to use any means to achieve their ends, as long as they do not come into conflict with the law in their sly ways. But even in such cases the dollar knows how to make hearts and the justice system compliant. The most capable lawyers are in the service of the financial magnates and, for high fees, they have no qualms about representing cases whose sordid nature they themselves see through best, and since the judiciary has not remained unscathed either, they only too often succeed in twisting the law in their clients' favor. The Americans are not even particularly indignant about such bending of the law; Anyone who knows American life knows that it is not a disgrace but a proof of cleverness and ability to skillfully circumvent the law. A slight regret that the sinner goes unpunished is combined with a secret joy at the power of the national giant, the dollar. It is a basic principle that everyone in his profession need only be a businessman and that the conscience of a businessman must not be narrower than the business opportunity. Yet the same Yankee who uses all whistles and kisses in his profession is a perfect man of honor in his private life who detests all dishonest ways. An old-fashioned European finds it difficult to reconcile himself with this double standard born of the conflict between greed and conscience.

`The omnipresent American business spirit is now also claiming its victims among naval personnel. The ironclad "Oregon" attempted to smuggle goods worth $750,000 into the port of San Francisco. The brilliant plan was discovered, however, and by order of the customs authorities, the entire crew, including the officers, were declared under arrest. All that was missing was for the "Oregon" and its contraband on board to be ordered to pursue a private smuggler, and the world would have witnessed a great farce.

Sad conditions prevail in the American army. In 1905, 6,533 men deserted, more than 10% of the 63,000 men who are supposed to make up the army of the Republic. Of these 63,000, 22,254 were discharged after their enlistment contract ended, and 9,460 had to leave because of illness or a court martial. One in six suffers from venereal disease.

Safety on the American railroads is so inadequate that the reader is horrified to learn that during the last quarter of 1905 no fewer than 2,077 collisions and 1,645 derailments occurred on the railroads of the United States, costing 1,109 lives and displacing 17,118 people. The majority of the accidents are attributed to the use of untrained personnel in responsible positions and to the overburdening of individual officials.

Nowhere is there more murder; the holy laziness that prevails in all areas is causing accidents and crimes to increase to such an extent that people are already starting to talk about street battlefields in the big cities. According to statistics from the Chicago Tribune, in 1905 there were 9212 murders in the United States = 115 per million inhabitants, compared to only 13 in Germany, 19 in France, and 27 in Great Britain. Even murderous Italy, with 105 per million, does not reach the American figure. The newspaper cites the lax application of the penal law and the countless back doors that are open to the wealthy criminal as the reasons.

Lynching courts are a stain on the history of American civilization, not because the people resort to self-help - that can be necessary in areas with few people - but because they indulge in the wildest, bestial cruelty under the pretext of justice.

In Greater New York alone, the number of people involved in the trafficking of girls is estimated at 20,000, i.e. every 200th inhabitant is directly or indirectly involved in this shady business. This is only possible because the demoralized North American police are in cahoots with the brothel owners and other henchmen of prostitution.[35]

Following the revelations of the horrific uncleanliness in the meat canning factories of Chicago, other details are now coming to light of the enormous adulteration of foodstuffs, the effects of which are nothing short of dreadful. It has been calculated that of the 700,000 children who died in the United States in 1904, about 455,000, or 65%, were killed more or less directly by adulterated foodstuffs. The laws against adulteration of foodstuffs are enacted by the individual states, apply only to them, and are, moreover, hardly observed due to general corruption.

The reader can expand at will on this selection of democratic indiscretions from the daily press. They are a burden on the system, not on the individual, even if one allows a great deal of scope for human weakness. For, in a clear line, all these evils are rooted in the abuse of freedom, for which the Americans have not found or do not want to find a corrective.

Whether a people is ruled and exploited by a prince, a caste of nobility or a clan of money men, it is basically the same, it is exploitation in every case. But the democratic trust barons are so good at plundering that the honest robber barons of the feudal era would have been ashamed of their bungling.

Sins are committed everywhere, and there is no need to moralize from a high horse when a swamp bubble arises somewhere, but there is a big difference between the deceptions of individuals and the systematic corruption of entire classes of officials and sections of the population.

If all salvation could really be expected from democracy, as its eulogists never tire of assuring us, then the Union, where the "sovereign," "mature" people direct their own affairs, would have to be a model for all other states in every respect. Nothing less than

35 1) E. R. F. Baumann: The girl trade in New York and how it is operated (The cadet system).

that; human passions prove stronger than the best laws, devised according to beautiful theories, if there is not a strong fist behind them to enforce them.

In and of itself, democracy is equal to and of equal value with other forms of government. Indeed, it is the ideal form of government where the conditions necessary for its prosperity are present: patriotic virtue and sentiment, devotion of the individual to the common good, simplicity and harmony in customs and way of life, the greatest possible equality in wealth and education, minimal ethnic differences, and a moderate population of the country, and where people have matured to such self-control that they no longer need external coercion to maintain order, or only need it to a minimal degree. Unfortunately, this dependence of democracy on the self-discipline of the citizens is almost always ignored; blind hatred of monarchy and aristocratic state order, out of aversion to all external coercion, is elevated to a principle, and the state is made a scapegoat for transgressions that arise solely from the state's own arbitrary will. It is certainly not difficult to prove that a hated government has made all sorts of mistakes, but compared to the situation that America is currently offering, even a pedantic and strict maintenance of order by a monarchical-aristocratic state is a far lesser evil.

Pure democracy has this in common with all other ideals: it always remains unattainable, and it will always be forced to make more or less compromises with the aristocracy. From the combination of these opposing forms of government, the one that best meets practical needs will emerge, in that the opposing forces keep each other in balance and prevent the complete subjugation of one part by the other. -

The distribution of material wealth in the United States is very unequal and unhealthy. The number of those who live below the average in good times, i.e. do not have the bare necessities, is estimated at 10 million. 50% of all families are without property. 55% of all private wealth is in the possession of only 1% of families. Only a relatively small part of the North American working class earns a lot, the great mass of the working population lives in poverty, and the actual proletariat is certainly less well off there than in Germany. In general, the worker is more exploited than here.

Given such conditions, it is surprising that the United States does not yet have socialism. Sombart, who dealt with this question, found the main reason as follows: 1. the worker can escape the yoke of capitalism at any time and become an independent farmer in the Far West by acquiring a home; 2. No party seeks to deprive the worker of his rights, the worker still counts for something; 3. The proletariat lives in too miserable a state to be able to think about socialist problems. But these obstacles to the development of socialism would disappear, and then America would also have its socialism.[36] Of course, it will get it, as free England got it so unexpectedly in the last two years, for it would be strange that the same causes (the equality phrase and material need) should not produce the same effects in America as elsewhere. -

It would be premature to paint America's future in gloomy colors. A century is like a day in the life of a nation. The drive toward greatness, which distinguishes the Americans not only in swindling but also in charity, and not least the insight into the untenability of the current extreme conditions, will prepare a better understanding and help the Americans overcome the democratic infantile disease. The change is already heralded, and it will continue to take place with the need for a natural law.

Just as freedom has degenerated into licentiousness on the one hand, it has also turned into its opposite and has thereby made equality illusory. The phrase which still drives Italians mad no longer concerns the real Yankee; equality before the law has long since become a legend. The Chinese sigh under the pressure of harsh foreign laws, and even harsher pressure weighs on the Negro, who in the few decades since his emancipation has been pushed down to the level of the tolerated and despised pariah. "In the southern states, Negroes have been deprived of the right to vote by law. In addition, the legislation and customs of almost the entire South have brought the Negro into a position of social and general inferiority which actually represents a strict caste system, the likes of which could hardly be imagined more completely in India. Negroes are forbidden to travel in the same train carriages and in the same carriages on the streetcars

36 Sombart: Why is there no socialism in the United States?

as whites. A Negro who addresses a white lady in a manner that is not entirely respectful is severely punished for disorderly conduct. No Negro is ever addressed as Mr., Mrs. or Miss. He is expected not to see himself in the presence of a white person. He is not allowed into theaters or concerts, or into churches attended by whites. Marriages between whites and colored people are legally prohibited and are punished in the event of a violation. Concubinage with colored women is not prohibited by law. At every turn, the Negro is made to understand that he belongs to the inferior, obedient race, that he is a pariah and that the ruling class demands obedience and respect from him."[37]

This has little to do with equality and even less to do with brotherhood. It is a cruel irony of world history and a spectacle for the gods that a democratic republic should reintroduce the caste system. In the Negro question the principle of equality celebrated its triumph, in this it is now suffering its fatal defeat. It was an experiment on a large scale that the opponents of slavery carried out at the expense of the slave owners. The facts have decided in favor of the lecters and given them satisfaction that was belated but no less brilliant for that. The result is of inestimable importance for the social question. What is now taking place in the United States is repeated on a small scale every day before our eyes, namely the confirmation of the age-old principle that inferiority is always and everywhere destined to serve and obey. Where it has nevertheless come to power by force, the glory has never lasted long. It is useful to occasionally remind the prophets of the future state and make them consider that "those who unhinge the state will be the first to have it fall on their heads."

After their emancipation, the Negroes had hardly been granted the right to vote and civil equality when it became clear how misguided this step had been. There is no doubt that the opponents of slavery, under the influence of the equality slogan, honestly believed that the black brother would gradually adapt to the new circumstances and prove himself worthy of the rights granted to him. Things turned out differently. The Negro, suddenly free of all constraints, not accustomed to independence and left to his

37 H. A. Fiedler: The Negro Question in the United States of North America. Prussian Yearbooks. Vol. 116.

innate wild impulses without inhibition, had nothing more urgent to do than to completely abuse his freedom under the guidance of rabid demagogues who deceived him with all sorts of things to further their own selfish ends.[38] Whatever the slave owners may have sinned by being harsh, it was child's play compared to the behavior displayed by the new citizens. Th. Dixon[39] describes in a gripping way the horrors of the first years after the slave war, when the whites of the southern states were exposed to the brutality of 5 million blacks; the corruption, the waste of money, the horrific crimes of the roving blacks, who had gone from being a piece of cattle that was bought and sold to being a beast that had to be shot at; the impoverishment and downfall of the noblest families, who, mostly descended from the English aristocracy and were among the most capable elements of the American population, were sacrificed in incomprehensible delusion to an exaggerated idea.

In order to preserve the land for the whites and to prevent culture from being threatened by the inability of the Negro to live, Dixon puts forward the radical demand that the Negroes should be deprived of their political rights and given back to their natural destiny, work in the service of the higher race ("to create a position of inferiority and superiority"); if the Negro does not want this, he should look for a new home in another part of the world. It is noteworthy that Dixon unhesitatingly abandons equality, the foundation of democracy, under the pressure of facts.

If carried out correctly, the idea of making the Negro work in the service of the whites can only benefit the Union without harming the Negro. It has been shown that the Negroes are capable of civilization to a limited extent if they are subjected to strict discipline and unyielding order in closed institutions for a long time, which awaken and strengthen the sense of responsibility, reflection and the power of self-control in these children of nature. In the United States there are several such institutions founded and run by friends of the Negroes, which are certainly a blessing to their offspring. But since it is impossible to drill all 8-9 million Negroes in this way, an attempt could be made to

38 See G. Sidney Camp: Democracy, in which the system is castigated (out of print in bookstores)
39 Dixon: White and Black. The novel has found astonishing popularity in the United States in a short time.

settle them on agricultural estates and have them work under the direction of strict but fair masters, and if necessary force them to work. The relationship of the Negroes to their masters would be that of mild slavery, or, since the word is taboo, of the servitude that was once common in Europe. Of course, the masters would have to control themselves above all else; they would have to serve as a role model for the Negro, and be able to inspire respect and awe in him. The Negro is capable of being worshipped, almost venerated, where civilization has not yet corrupted him. In exploiting this urge, the future landowners should take the Brahmans, who were almost idolized by the Negroes, as their role model.[40]

This solution to the Negro question would remove the Negro from the cities that are damaging him and bring him into orderly conditions that would allow him to gradually increase his limited cultural abilities through inheritance. The United States, however, would create a down-to-earth rural nobility as a counterweight to the moneyed aristocracy, independent of industry and trade, which, far from the unhealthy activity of the cities and under observation of the laws of racial breeding and, if necessary, caste separation, would develop a new type of nobleman and would provide the state with incorruptible judges, capable statesmen, warriors and officials. Among the 70 million whites in the Union there are certainly still a few thousand healthy men of Germanic descent who could form the basis of the new nobility, and there is no lack of space for country estates in a state whose area is almost twenty times that of Germany[41]. The labor of the Negro, which has hitherto been almost entirely idle, would find an extensive and ideal use, much better than in the cities, where the Negro cannot compete with the superior intelligence of the white man.

Of course, Pauline Christianity should not be preached to the Negro, whose assertion of the equality of men before God would turn into fermenting dragon dung in his brain. The unrest currently prevailing among the natives of South Africa is mainly

40 Gobineau II 215.

41 In a similar way, by the emigration of a few thousand young, able German men from the upper classes to the German colonies, these areas could very quickly be opened up to culture, using the labor of the Negro.

caused by the provocative speeches of a bunch of black scoundrels who appear as clergymen, tell the colored people that they are just as valuable as the whites and call on them to throw off their yoke. The movement is led from the United States. Instead of Christianity, for which the Negro is evidently not yet ready, he must be implanted with the religious idea with which the Brahmins tamed the bestial natives of India. I will come back to this.

Fiedler gives a vivid description of the religious life of the Negroes during slavery, which, although the matter is otherwise serious, is not without its comical side: "Some gentlemen arranged for white preachers to hold a service for them from time to time. In general, however, this was done by colored preachers who were themselves slaves and were whipped if they did so. This actually happened quite frequently, since according to the unanimous testimony of travelers, these colored preachers were usually the laziest and most morally depraved of their race. Since it was forbidden by law to teach Negroes to read, one can imagine what a blasphemous caricature of Christianity such a Negro service offered. The "sermon" was full of bombastic nonsense, the members of the congregation expressed their emotion through bestial bellowing, enthusiastic ecstasies and contortions of limbs, and the whole thing looked desperately like an African incantation dance."[42]

Without instruction, the Negro is and remains a more or less harmless animal, but if he learns to read and dabbles in education, the idea of equality, which does not know the limits of his abilities, gives him a ridiculous megalomania that seduces him into wanting to play the master and imitate the white man and to enter into a hopeless, unfortunate competition with the superior intelligence of the white man. So away with enlightenment for the Negro. Bring him into a mild slavery, into the state that only corresponds to his abilities. They are false friends who want to force our civilization on him at any price.

From the moral teachings of Christianity, which proclaim the right of personality

42 Fiedler: The Negro Question. 1. c.

and the most pronounced individualism, the conclusion has been drawn that slavery is reprehensible under all circumstances - and in doing so, it has overshot the mark. For it is clear that the views of Christianity on slavery cannot have any validity where there are not yet developed, independent personalities, as is the case with the Negroes. Brotherhood by no means excludes inequality.

Yes, if Christianity had really abolished slavery, then one could find the enthusiasm and brotherly feelings of the Reds and Blacks on the Spree for the Blacks on the Congo understandable, but it has only abolished the open, honest and therefore less immoral slavery of the Negroes, while allowing the hidden, undignified and worse slavery of the white man to continue because it was powerless to abolish it. The leather whip has been replaced by the hunger whip. "In the past, the master hunted slaves. Today, the slave must hunt the master and beg for the privilege of serving him and kicking others to death," Dixon has a worker say. "No, I am not shedding crocodile tears over the slavery of the Negroes in the South. It was a mild form of servitude in which the Negroes had enough food and clothing, never froze, slept soundly and raised their children in herds without having to think about the next day."[43]

All anthropologists agree on the Negro's poor ability to civilize. While the whites have accomplished one great deed after another over the course of thousands of years, the Negro has not progressed beyond the humblest beginnings of a civilization (Negro Republic of Liberia). So why should we grant human rights to those who have not yet developed into human beings and who only play tricks on human dignity?

If slavery gives the Negro what he needs for his progress: the example of a good master and habituation to discipline and strict order, then it can be justified even from the standpoint of Christianity. It can even be required if it should become apparent that the Negro cannot be helped forward in any other way. An occasional beating, once it is deserved, does him no harm either in his physical or eternal salvation and is in any case felt far less intensely spiritually than the kicks with which fate so abundantly bestows on

43 Dixon: White and Black 406

many noble men.

Pain is of a universal nature; it is the educator of humanity, the driving force behind all development, and the foaming indignation of the raging demagogues when they learn that a Negro has had his thick skin beaten out a little, only proves that they lack any understanding of this important law of life. Cruelty and unnecessary harshness are of course not to be excused, but without discipline and disciplinary measures it never works anywhere, not even in the Social Democratic Party, where Bebel makes disobedient comrades cower and "fly".

The learned Negro bishop Booker Washington, whom President Roosevelt is fond of, to the chagrin of all supporters of a clean separation between white and black, is, like other so-called learned Negroes, a half-breed who owes his higher abilities only to his share of nobler blood and therefore cannot be used to replace the talents of the Negroes. The Yankee, in his aversion to everything Negro, makes no distinction at all between full-blood and half-blood; both are equally repulsive to him. This aversion is already so great in the United States that even those whose appearance does not at all betray to the untrained eye of the European that a drop of Negro blood runs through their veins from distant ancestors, are treated with the same merciless contempt as the full-blooded Negroes by the experienced Yankee, who can detect this origin with unmistakable certainty by certain inconspicuous signs, such as the shape of the ears, nose, and head. It has already been said that marriages between whites and blacks are legally prohibited. Recently, a white woman who had married a Negro was sentenced to ten years in prison, and the judges regretted that they could not impose a harsher sentence.

Such harshness seems barbaric, but it is explained by the general fact that inclinations and passions, when they have reached their peak, tend to turn into the opposite. And another thing can be seen, namely that nature does not want the wild mixing of races and that racial hatred is the means of preserving the species.

The Negro question in the United States is of interest to us not only because it shows the complete collapse of the idea of equality in practice in the country, but also

because we must approach the problem more closely with the black population of our colonies and can easily avoid the mistakes made by America.

But there are other phenomena besides the disenfranchisement of the Negro that speak for the awakening of the aristocratic idea in the United States. When the daughter of the current President Roosevelt, "Princess" Alice, as she was often called, offered her hand for life to Congressman Longworth, the ceremony became a remarkable demonstration of the American aristocratic principle, which seemed almost like a mockery of democracy, since it took place in the sanctuary of democracy, the White House.

It is no new discovery that there is an American aristocracy, a strictly exclusive caste which rules and directs the country by virtue of supposed advantages of birth and fortune, but the fact has never been made so clear as by the style of this wedding ceremony. The unofficial invitations were restricted to the families of that inner circle of the American aristocracy who, by lineage and reputation, have a dominion over the millions of the democracy which mere wealth cannot create. Inspired by a pride similar to that of the Norwegian peasants, these American families boast of being able to trace their descent back to the first settlers in Virginia and the New England states.

One report says that even in St. George's Chapel at Windsor, in aristocratic England, no gala gathering ever took place in which the principle of hereditary aristocracy was more strongly emphasized than at this ceremony. Democracy was filled with shy reverence by the royal exclusivity of the celebration. It had to stay outside the high enclosure that surrounds the White House grounds and could only stare in amazement at the wall that separated it from the events inside the house that were being followed with such burning interest. In the future, the gates and walls between the White House grounds and the outside world will be considered a social barrier, for no family that has not managed to get one of its members to cross this barrier at the celebration will ever be able to claim American nobility for itself.

In America, therefore, the opposite of what we see here is happening: here

progressive democratization, there significant beginnings of the aristocratization of society, and it is very likely that this process will accelerate rather than come to a standstill due to the peculiar American conditions.

The problem of racial improvement has been occupying Americans for some time, but no tangible results have been achieved. The plan to regulate immigration for this purpose, to encourage the influx of Germanic elements from Germany, England and Scandinavia, but to make it more difficult for Slavic, Romanic and Jewish elements, has not yet progressed beyond the first attempts, but even if it is implemented, it will hardly produce the desired result. The Yankees can prevent the influx of undesirable elements through legislation, but they cannot bring in Germans, English and Scandinavians at will, since the United States has lost much of its appeal due to the significantly more difficult living conditions.

An American scholar and plant breeder, who also devotes his attention to the racial question, made a remarkable statement about the future and prospects of his people. He said that crossbreeding in the human family, as in plants, produces the best and the worst qualities in full force. But now that the necessary crossbreeding has been accomplished in America, the work of weeding out and refinement now comes. He is firmly convinced that the Americans will become the most capable race in the world in the course of time (of course!) if they will now seriously devote themselves to this work of weeding out and refinement. In the mixture that will then remain, the characteristic qualities of the many peoples who have taken part in the formation of the American blood will be evident, whereby many of the bad qualities of these peoples will no longer be present, but the good ones will be enhanced.

There is undoubtedly some truth in this line of thought, but the good man thinks of the problem too simply. He boldly but one-sidedly applies his experience from plant practice to humans and forgets to say how the matter might take place, and so the poet's words apply here too:

Thoughts live easily together,
but things collide hard in space.

Animals and plants have to put up with being eradicated, but in human society and especially in a democracy it is not entirely without danger. A real democrat does not want to be eradicated. And he is right. In a democracy the individual is decisive, and eradication contradicts the principle of equal rights for all. Only in the aristocratic form of government can the lower and the individual take a back seat in favor of the higher and the whole.

But once the necessity of eradication has been admitted: who should do it, who should be affected by it and how should it be done? Should the victims be banished, castrated or condemned to celibacy? In whose hands does the decision lie? The difficulties inherent in these questions are insurmountable.

Since the direct elimination of the incompetent is therefore not possible, only an indirect way remains for the refinement of the race, namely to select among the capable and let them marry each other with the clear intention of breeding a higher type of human being who would be far superior in physical health and beauty, in intelligence and morality to the average Yankee with his one-sidedly developed predatory instinct.

If the breeding principle of excluding everything inferior is strictly adhered to, the desired result would occur after just a few generations, but the reader will also easily notice that this would create an institution of hereditary nobility that one would think had been finally eliminated. But whoever wants the end must also want the means, especially since in this case there would be no valid reasons against either.

Such a nobility, if I may say so, born of the first generation, could certainly count on sympathy in America and, if it forced the undisciplined democracy into order, it could fundamentally change the social physiognomy of the Union and transform the state into an aristocracy par excellence. The conditions for such a new formation are very favorable in America, because the mismanagement of democracy is preparing a backlash and preaches with forceful clarity the lesson that an excess of freedom can be

just as hostile to culture as despotism.

If what the English philosopher says is true, that progress and development follow the direction of least resistance, the plan of educating the masses through an exemplary aristocracy cannot be denied any chance of being realized. If the Americans are granted their own cultural flowering, it will be much easier to win over a limited number of thinkers, who would initially serve as a crystallization point, to the idea of racial improvement and related questions than the broad masses, who have neither understanding nor interest in such things. In this way, no one would have to be eliminated; no one would be disadvantaged except the scoundrels, who would be deprived of their influence on government and administration and could otherwise be left to their own misery.

As far back as one goes in the history of culture, it was always a few great minds or a small circle of wise men who served as leaders and role models for the masses and enabled them to make modest progress. The history of humanity is always the history of a select few; the rest pass by unnoticed. It is a beautiful and forgivable dream that has often been dreamed and will often be dreamed that it is possible to advance humanity as a whole in a step-by-step manner. Many an enthusiast, many an idealist, has bled to death from this illusion. Since the present level of culture is the product of immeasurable periods of time and countless generations, and humanity still has eternities ahead of it to achieve further perfection, progress in any given epoch can only ever be small. We people of the present day, drunk with progress, must especially guard against deception and self-deception. Have we really become so much better and wiser in the last century, given the dazzling achievements of technology? I dare not imagine what would happen if the stumbling blocks of our order, police and military, were suddenly removed. -

The creation of a new aristocracy is only the beginning. The new aristocracy may be as capable and exemplary as it is, but it will still have to wage a grueling and futile struggle against the resistance and attacks of the nagging democracy as long as the latter believes, according to the misunderstood teaching of Christianity, that narrow-

mindedness, mediocrity and poverty are something particularly pleasing to God.

Therefore the aristocracy must not make a false peace with false Christianity, let alone expect or give it support. The dogma of equality which has degenerated into social democracy is the mortal enemy of any social class division, and the logical conclusion is that we must no longer follow this will-o'-the-wisp, but must look for another, better basis for the state order. For on the basis of the presumed equality before God, from which, according to the logic of the mob, equality on earth follows, social democracy is theoretically right and its opponents are wrong. In practice, however, the opponents of social democracy are right, so that for them, who are based on the firm ground of facts, the only task left is the admittedly not easy one of defeating their opponents theoretically as well, of thoroughly destroying the foundation which supports the airy edifice of equality.

Inequality.

Fifty years ago, Gobineau wrote at the end of his treatise on India:

"This wonderful colossus of intellect, strength and beauty has presented the Western world since Herodotus with the image of one of those priestesses who, although covered with a thick robe and a delicate veil, were nevertheless able to convince everyone by the majesty of their bearing that they were beautiful. In the twenty years in which linguistic research, philosophy and statistics have begun to take stock of Indian society and the Indian character, and with almost no prospect of being able to master it completely in a very long time, the material is so abundant and plentiful, the opposite of what ordinary experience shows has occurred: the less a thing is known, the more it is admired; but here, the better one knows and appreciates it, the more one admires it. Accustomed to the limited existence of our civilizations, we calmly repeat the words of the Psalter about the frailty of human affairs, and when the immense curtain which concealed Asiatic life and its activity was drawn back, and India and China with their

unshakable constitutions appeared clearly before our eyes, we did not know how to accept this discovery, so humiliating to our wisdom and our strength. What a disgrace indeed to systems which have, and still do, praise themselves as without equal! What a lesson for the states of the West, which, through the instability of their religious convictions, are condemned to change form and direction incessantly, like the moving dunes of certain North Sea shores."[44]

What Gobineau predicted with a prescient spirit has since come true; India still offers us material for inspiration and admiration.

Today I am picking out a gem from the treasures of Indian intellectual life which, although unknown as such in the West, is the only one capable of giving stability and permanence to our social order, which is trembling under the blows of a democracy gone mad, and of ensuring its peaceful development: the inequality of men before God.

What Gobineau predicted with a prescient spirit has since come true; India still offers us material for inspiration and admiration.

Today I have picked out from the treasures of Indian intellectual life a gem which, although unknown as such in the West, is the only one capable of giving stability and permanence to our social order, which is trembling under the blows of a democracy gone mad, and of allowing it to develop peacefully: the inequality of people before God.

This idea, as common in India as the dogma of equality is in Europe, is present in the consciousness of the Hindus, not in the succinct form of a slogan, but with such clarity and strength that the idea of equality cannot arise, a fact which is all the more astonishing as there has never been a lack of elements in India that would have given reason enough to borrow. The religion of the Indians must therefore have a very solid foundation, so that it could prevent the intrusion of subversive elements and maintain the

44 Vol. II. 289.

social order of India unchallenged for several thousand years (!).

In India we are dealing with a social body that has developed correctly on the basis of correct assumptions and owes its durability to this consistent development. Every inappropriate state is an untenable state; this applies to all natural realms, as well as to the state, and especially to the state, because conflicting forces are constantly bringing about changes in it. Indian society, measured by durability, must therefore be recognized as having a high degree of durability, and in our times of need it is really worth the effort to seek instruction from the wisdom of the Brahmins.

Europeans are accustomed to describing the caste system prevailing in India as hard, rigid, cruel, tyrannical, merciless and who knows what else, partly out of ignorance, partly with the veiled intention of arousing feelings of pity, regret and disgust, and of making the excellence of our own situation shine all the more brightly. But it seems to me that we pity the Indians most unnecessarily and give ourselves undeserving credit. A certain rigidity of form is in itself no more a disadvantage than changeability is automatically an advantage, and if their system were not suitable for the Indians, they would have abolished it long ago. And furthermore, is our money-caste system above reproach?

The caste system did not appear immediately with the certainty in which we know it, but rather it developed logically from the previous state of a loose class system, and it can be considered certain that its strict formation was preceded by something similar to what we observe in America: the threat to whites and their most sacred goods from the Negroes. Blacks formed the original population in India, which was subjugated and made subservient by the whites who were pushing in from the north.

Since over time there had been many intermingling of whites and blacks and a race of bastards had emerged, there was no other way for the insightful men who recognized the danger of the total negroification of the whites to avert it than to strictly prohibit all mixed marriages. All professions were made hereditary, and no one was allowed to marry outside of his caste.

The Indian word for caste is varna and means color, and in fact even today, when Negro blood has more or less taken hold of the upper classes of the population despite all defensive measures, the castes of Brahmins, warriors, citizens and the casteless or Çudras are by and large graded according to color. I say by and large because India is not a unified kingdom and there are great differences in the population. Thus, mainly in the south, where less Aryan blood has penetrated, the Brahmins are darker in color than the warriors and citizens of the north, and they also behave accordingly to this difference in color. Therefore, the bad things said about these Brahmins should not be applied to all of them. Max Müller warns urgently against the method of generalization, which gives a completely false picture of the Indians; it is hardly conceivable that one can say with certainty about all the inhabitants of India, and he admits that he always feels a slight nervous tremor when he reads a sentence that begins with the words: "the Indian people", or "all Brahmins", or "all Buddhists"; what follows is almost always wrong.[45]

The explanation first given by Gobineau that the introduction of the caste system was only an act of self-defense to save the white race is very plausible and natural, since it can be found in parallels in the present, and it deserves preference over the view of the Indologist L. v. Schroeder, who believes that the caste system is only the result of the growing arrogance and desire for power of the Brahmin class[46]. On the other hand, it is a fact that the Brahmins did not fail to make a mild and just regime the duty of the kings and to see paternal attitudes as the most beautiful. princely virtue, and that they have never stretched out their hands to worldly power.

Secular rule would not have brought the Brahmins the advantages that usually accompany power and prestige and make their possession seem desirable. This is true from the Indian Middle Ages, when the caste system came into being - they led an extremely simple life, for which our proletarians, enlightened by the Social Democrats about their true purpose in life, would be very grateful. Meat and alcohol were forbidden to them as food; they were excluded from all profitable trades; for their livelihood they

45 Max Müller: India and its world-historical significance. 31.
46 L. v. Schroeder: India’s literature and culture in historical development. 156.

were dependent on the generosity of the nobles and the people and only in emergencies were they allowed to trade in harmless things. "Their kingdom was not of this world." When they noticed the signs of old age and saw their children's children, they had to leave their families, move into the forest as hermits, feed ascetically on herbs, roots and fruits and devote themselves entirely to the contemplation of the highest things and the knowledge of Brahman. I do not believe that such a way of life seems particularly tempting to our European scholars, who accuse the Brahmins of being tyrannical.

But the Brahmins by no means gave up the spiritual leadership of the people, and that was just as sensible as giving up worldly power, because it was their due by virtue of their greater share of the white blood and the resulting enormous spiritual superiority over the mixed-race blacks. Or should they have made the stupid pariah, who was 90% or more black, the master of the highly gifted whites, as was attempted in America, but which soon reverted from this madness? Anyone who is upset that the vast majority of people are condemned to service, narrow-mindedness and passivity, and that the brotherhood promised 1900 years ago has still not come, must take issue with the Creator, who created people so unequal, not with the wise and strong, who will never give up their rule for the sake of a whim. Even the democratic mob leaders are not joking on this point.

And furthermore, the Brahmins, who voluntarily chose poverty, cannot be accused of having placed religion in the service of material interests - an accusation that the Christian clergy so often have to put up with. They were wise enough to see that a price must be paid for any kind of power, and that worldly goods always represent a dangerous temptation for the true interests of religion. To rule and enjoy, and to enjoy in order to do so, without anything in return, are incompatible and untenable in a civilized state in the long run; the rulers of the West, both large and small, should take this to heart.

But if we accept the opinion that the Brahmins acted purely out of arrogance and a desire for power, it is no less true that they nevertheless made an inestimable

contribution to culture. They have postponed the decline of India and the extinction of the white race in the mire of negrism for at least 1,000 or 1,500 years, and have thereby enabled us to inherit the Indian intellectual life, whose profound metaphysical truths we so urgently need as a counterweight to our materialistic habits. "If I were asked under what heaven the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered upon the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions to some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant, I should point to India. And if I asked myself from which literature we in Europe, which has fed almost exclusively on the ideas of the Greeks and Romans, and a Semitic race, the Jews, can derive the corrective we most need in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in truth more human, to make it a life not only for this world, but a transfigured and eternal one - I would again point to India.[47] -

The second rank was occupied by the warriors or nobles, who took care of political affairs and administration and, like the Brahmins, only occasionally engaged in a trade. The real basis of the state was the middle class, which carried out all kinds of trades, trade and agriculture and whose rights were vigorously protected by the statesmanlike Brahmins, who recognized the essential importance of a secure middle class.

Our state leaders, on the other hand, listening to the pipe of the socialist rat catchers, were of the opinion for a while that the middle class was destined to be crushed between the millstones of big capital on the one hand and the proletariat on the other; this was the result of the development of conditions and could not be changed. Fortunately, people are beginning to turn away from this foolish, suicidal policy and are giving the middle class, which mitigates and bridges the stark contrast between rich and poor, the boot it deserves.

> Who is the most worthy member of the state? A valiant citizen;
> In any form he remains the noblest substance. Goethe.

47 M. Müller: India in its world-historical significance 5.

The Çudras, also called pariahs, the colored natives, were the slaves, the servants of the Hindus and had to do the menial work. They had no rights, but were well treated and in return served the Brahmins with fanatical devotion.

The Indian social order was a well-balanced system of forces, built on the broad foundation of the middle class, defended by strength, guided by wisdom and served by non-intelligence, and as far as earthly things can be ideal, it certainly deserves this description.[48]

However, even the best state and social order cannot satisfy all people equally. As soon as life begins to become more sophisticated, demands grow and the feeling for right and wrong and for inequality becomes more acute, friction arises, dissatisfied people, grumblers and troublemakers appear who examine the norms of society under a critical magnifying glass and, depending on their statesmanlike talent, criticize them sensibly and initiate reforms, or, like immature and selfish demagogues, exploit the interests of the state for their own benefit.

India would not have been spared from corrosive criticism, which found more than enough opportunities for attack, and from dangerous innovations, if religious views had not developed with the caste system, in some cases even before it, which directed criticism from the institutions to the individual.

The Brahmins did not tell the Negro and the mixed-race Negro, as simple missionaries do, that he was just as valuable before God as the white man, but they taught him that if he had led a right life he would be reborn into a higher caste, as a citizen. The citizen would return as a warrior, the warrior as a Brahmin, but the latter would be raised to the gods after his death. In this way he too would have a chance of one day reaching the level of the Brahmin. However, advancement to the higher caste depended on the faithful fulfillment of worldly and religious duties; on the other hand, failure to fulfill one's duties, as well as transgressions and sins, would result in punishment in hell, and the series of births would have to begin again from the

48 For details that I cannot go into here, compare Gobineau, who also does not hold back with his criticism.

beginning.

This system of rewards and punishments, which of course applied to all Indians, has had its effect up to the present day and has given the country an inner peace that our troubled social politicians, who are drawing from the leaky barrel of the Danaids, can envy[49]. This is all the more remarkable because this doctrine contains nothing that flatters the rabble and its base desires. Rather, the opposite is the case. No less strange is that it has been believed for almost three thousand years by this people, who are so metaphysically gifted and who have produced first-rate thinkers. The Indian thinkers were bold enough to shake up the highest and most sacred, but with the exception of a few shallow materialists, they have never touched this doctrine, unless one wants to understand the view that the world of appearances is only Maya, illusion, as a negation. There must therefore be a compelling force within it, something that commands respect and awe; faith must have attained the certainty of knowledge.

In its purest form, the religious beliefs of the Hindus are as follows: Every human soul (Atman) is a part of the deity (Brahman) and has the task of rising from a lowly beginning to divine heights and perfection.[50] The body is the means by which the soul gains experience. Development does not take place in one earthly life, which is too short for the purpose, but in numerous incarnations, which are so interconnected that the actions of one life determine the content of the next. The incarnation is repeated until the goal is reached. No one is excluded from salvation unless he excludes himself, and salvation is everyone's own work. There are no eternal punishments, every guilt can be atoned for in time. The time between two incarnations includes hell and heaven, which of course must be understood not in terms of location, but in terms of state, as the soul's consciousness of guilt and bliss. Just as there are no eternal punishments in hell, the joys of heaven do not last forever either, for everything is transitory and subject to change.

---

49 Compare Gustave Le Bon's work on India. (Paris).

50 Schiller: When the Creator from his face
Relegated man to mortality,
And a late return to the light
Told him to find himself on a difficult path of the senses....
(The Artists.)

Like people and human races, worlds and world systems with the life processes and conditions chained to them also have their limited duration, after which the cycle of existence begins again under different forms and conditions. "Everything is impermanent," said the Exalted One.

In the Cathapatha-Brahmana it says: "As a weaver takes a piece from a colorful garment and weaves another, new, more beautiful form, so too the spirit in death lets this body fall and consciousness dies out and prepares another, new form for itself.... As it has acted, as it has changed, so it becomes: whoever has done good becomes a good being, whoever has done evil becomes an evil one; he becomes pure through pure deed, evil through evil deed. So he who is caught up in desire. He who is without desire, who is free of desire, who only desires the Atman, who has attained his desire, from his body the breath forces do not escape into another body, but contract here; he is the Brahman and to Brahman he goes. Man's nature is based on desire. As his desire is, so is his striving; as his striving is, such deed (Karma) he does; whatever deed he does, he attains such an existence."[51]

Two laws are expressed in it, of whose validity the Indians are deeply convinced: that thoughts and desires are forces whose effects are not lost, but rather shape our character - the preservation of power in the spiritual realm too - and that everyone reaps what he has sown, or that the effect corresponds to the cause - the causality of the event.

Strict, unchangeable law governs the cosmos. Every human action inevitably leads to very specific consequences, which cannot be avoided and which are in a lawful relationship to the cause.

No one suffers more than he is guilty of, and no one enjoys more bliss than he has earned.

In Indian thought, both laws are united under the name karma, which literally means deed, action. A person's karma is his moral merit and his moral guilt, and his fate in his later existence is shaped by the predominance of one or the other. "Fate" and

51 L. v. Schröder: India’s Culture and Literature 250.

"original sin" could well be considered karma, which gave the previously rather meaningless words a sharply defined, deep meaning.

There is something extremely uplifting and satisfying in the idea that man literally forges his own happiness and misfortune, completely independent of the mood or envy of a vengeful God. Instead of accusing others, quarreling with God and the world and finally becoming a social democrat, everyone must, as befits the wise, seek the cause of his misfortune within himself and say to himself: I brought my misfortune upon myself in the past, only what is right is happening to me, I am reaping the rewards of my deeds and experiencing the justice of the law.

The democratic principle of the autocracy of the individual, which was developed one-sidedly by Christianity, finds its necessary corrective in the doctrine of karma in the form of full personal responsibility, without which it all too easily degenerates into a war of all against all. The greater the external freedom, the stronger the inner law must be.

L. v. Schroeder, who fully recognizes the advantages of the karma doctrine and its beneficial influence on moral behavior, cannot help but declare it to be an error.[52] This is not surprising. Orthodoxy, with its stubborn adherence to stale dogmas, has aroused an insurmountable mistrust of everything supernatural, bordering on hatred, in most representatives of science, and has driven many thinkers straight into the arms of materialism. On the other hand, it is not uncommon for scholars to confuse unprovability with impossibility or unreality. What is unprovable today and is therefore denied can be common knowledge in ten or twenty years. The history of science is full of examples of hasty statements having to be retracted later, but unfortunately science does not seem to have learned from these bad experiences to practice beneficial restraint.

Proving something is a different matter. It will be in vain to try to prove to a color-blind person the existence of phenomena that a healthy person sees, because his eyes see differently. If we now imagine that all of humanity is color-blind, they would consider this condition to be normal and would declare any healthy person who came among

52 1. c. 401.

them and claimed to see more and differently to be sick and his claims to be false or at least unprovable. We experience such a process every day in other forms. Higher truths, like beauty, must be felt, seen and experienced internally. Where the predisposition for this is lacking, where the spiritual eye fails, all proofs are in vain. "Penetrating into the truth of a matter is always a mysterious act, of which the best logicians can only speak superficially" (Carlyle). The lack of a purely formal proof should not prevent us from examining the doctrine of karma for its usefulness for our circumstances; here higher considerations are decisive.

The idea of the strict legality of everything that happens, of being helplessly trapped in the iron ring of necessity, is well suited to triggering fatalistic, depressing thoughts and making us ask whether the cheerful Christian faith, which commands us to place everything trustingly in the hands of the kind father, is not preferable. But on closer examination, we are no better off with the kind father; according to his inscrutable plan, he makes the embarrassing excuse that always appears punctually when we would like a reason, usually contrary to our wishes, and the more we trust in his guidance, as Christianity does demands, the more one renounces one's own supposed freedom, one approaches fatalism.

Science has long since done away with the concept of free will, or rather brought it back to the right level. Free will is not a constant, but a variable, and therefore different for each person and dependent on the level of his experience and insight. In the case of the animal man, who blindly follows his drives and desires and is still completely a slave to his lower nature, there can be no talk of free will at all; it only begins with the civilized man, grows with the intelligent man, and reaches its highest level with the rational, moral man who has overcome the world and its desires and achieved full self-control. According to old experience, however, those who are least capable of freedom are the ones who swear the most about it.

Since the validity of the law of causality is unassailable for the material world and very probable for the spiritual world, in my opinion no one loses anything who

exchanges belief in the leadership of the world and human destiny by a personal God for belief in karma, the lawful course of human development. Anyone who is frightened and oppressed by rigid, terrible necessity is freed from the arbitrariness of a capricious God and can furthermore use this good law to serve his purposes through conscious submission to it, which never deceives, never wavers.

The belief in fate, in the unavoidable necessity of all events, can be found more or less clearly and decisively in the most important cultured peoples and in all major religions. It was developed to the highest and purest degree among the Indians. The ancient Germanic tribes had it in a somewhat cruder form. It was also very pronounced among the Greeks, as we already know from Homer. Christianity wanted and had to avoid it in order to save free will and not endanger the theory of salvation, but it got into other embarrassments.

Whether belief in karma and reincarnation is life-affirming or life-negative depends entirely on the standpoint from which one approaches religious problems and what purpose one assumes for development. If the goal is optimistic, so is the path, whatever else it may bring.

Anyone who sees the affirmation of life in the diligent consumption of oysters and champagne will hardly praise as optimistic a doctrine which tells him that he will one day have to bear the unpleasant consequences of this strengthening and development of the lower side of his being, while the moral person does not ask so much about the pleasant or unpleasant side of a religion as about its eternal values and its ability to elevate and sanctify him.

In the West, Buddhism is usually portrayed as denying life[53] and, in contrast, Christianity as affirming life - a somewhat bold undertaking that only succeeds tolerably well if one treats both unequally: taking Christianity from its light and pleasant side, stripping it of its world-fleeing features and highlighting these in all their severity in Buddhism, although one could know that Buddha himself rejected asceticism and Christ

53 Chamberlain wittily describes it as "lived suicide".

fasted for forty days. Such a sweet Christianity must ultimately have an unnerving effect on the peoples who take it as a guideline. Let us hope, in the interests of our people, that the soft souls who fear everything harsh like the plague do not gain the majority.

When Buddha said: all life is suffering! He, who saw the secret seed of things more clearly than other mortals, may well have had a reason for such a statement, which seems exaggerated to us, and it was only logical that he taught to overcome the desires whose satisfaction always provides new nourishment for the will to live, but it arises from a misleading, unfortunately very common, understanding of Nirvana when it is said that he set non-existence as the goal. Buddha did not speak clearly about Nirvana at all; he said that knowing what Nirvana is does not contribute to salvation.

Nirvana means extinction, blowing away, namely of sensual desires and drives and of the will to live, which compels reincarnation, although life and consciousness, even very intensive, are quite conceivable, at least for those who, with Kant, view time and space as forms of perception.

The glutton who gives in to unbridled pleasure-seeking must, as a rule, experience that his intense affirmation of life develops into a painful denial of it in the form of gout, kidney and liver problems. Suffering makes him acutely aware that life has other purposes than the satisfaction of animal desires; it teaches him to strive for purer, spiritual pleasures that cause little or no suffering and raise him to a higher level. By trying to avoid suffering, man exerts his strength, thinks, invents, develops skills, gathers experience and wisdom, until he increasingly outgrows the rod of suffering and does what is right out of free choice. Suffering understood in the broadest sense: servitude, poverty, illness are faithful companions on the lower stages of human development, the indispensable teacher without whom spiritual progress is impossible and which can only be escaped by self-discipline and the development of one's abilities; it is the melting pot that transforms animal desires and base passions into the gold of moral strength. Suffering is the price that must be paid for perfection.

Why God has prescribed this thorny path for humanity, why millions of tormented

creatures must cry out every day, no wise man has yet found the answer and no one will ever find it. Perhaps this law of development is only a special case of the larger law of reciprocity. But it is certain, and can be confirmed by a thousand examples from life, that experience cannot be gained by any other path.

So as long as there are undeveloped human souls who want and need to gain experience because wisdom can only be achieved at this price, there will be suffering and the social question - just another word for suffering - will remain unsolved.

Any solution to the social question can only ever be relative. The obstacle lies in man himself. The earth is rich enough to feed at least five times as many people as it does today, and yet there is so much need everywhere. If earthly material happiness were the purpose of existence, the formula for granting it to all people equally would have been found long ago, but the best plans and intentions to reduce and eliminate misery fail because of human stupidity and malice, and the benefactor can often still be cruel if he comes away uncrucified and unburned.

The inequality of material possessions and intellectual development is only one side of the social question, and not even the most important one. We see that proletarians who suddenly rise to the top through a stroke of luck do not change their character at all. If the man was previously of low character, this becomes even more apparent in all its wretchedness against the pompous background. The oppressed quickly becomes an oppressor.

And how many educated proletarians are there among the wealthy, who have at their disposal everything that is wonderful and good that man has ever thought of, but who, despite all the material goods, suffer spiritually and are content with the most banal fare because their minds are not yet ripe for the intake of nobler nourishment. The little verse applies to such a moneyed rabble: Put a frog on a golden chair, and he will jump back into the pond.

Suffering also finds its explanation in the doctrine of karma and reincarnation, and in this respect it achieves more than all other religions. Christianity does indeed say that

suffering aims at the moral purification of man, but firstly Christianity suffers from an unacceptable belief in immortality, and secondly it remains unbalanced and unexplained that and why the vast majority of people suffer for no reason. The question of the cause and purpose of suffering will, however, seem more important to humanity in the near future than playing around with the riddles of the world, the solution of which will more or less always remain an attempt with unsuitable means, and on an unsuitable object at that. According to the doctrine of karma, every existence, even the most apparently purposeless, has its purpose; it serves to pay off karmic debts and to gather new experiences, whereas from the Christian point of view most people, especially those of lower levels, would be better off not being born, because for them the words of the great Indian "all life is suffering" have almost unlimited validity.

If we assume that humanity is developing, only two possibilities are conceivable for its direction: either for the better or for the worse. Since our materialists do not deny development, but have made it their slogan, and development in itself means almost exclusively progress towards better, higher things, every view of life that assumes the same goal is unconditionally optimistic, even if it spreads progress over many lives, the greater number of which is very disappointing.

With regard to the ultimate goal of human development, belief in karma and reincarnation is optimistic, but with regard to any fleeting earthly existence it is pessimistic insofar as the desires that cause suffering must be denied.[54] But this does not require fleeing to deserts or becoming an ascetic; self-control can be practiced anywhere, and best of all in the hustle and bustle of life. On the other hand, all right striving, sacrifice for the fatherland, fulfilling one's duty in the service of humanity and the whole range of Christian virtues are firmly affirmed by the doctrine of karma; the more good a person does, the more he benefits himself and humanity, so that Goethe's beautiful saying:

54 The pessimism of a Buddha is of course of a nobler kind than that of the egoist, who becomes depressed when he has to forgo a usual pleasure.

For the capable man this world is not silent,
Let him stand firm and look around here.

remains true in a higher sense even in the doctrine of karma. The doctrine of karma occupies the middle ground between the wild, materialistic belief in this world of social democracy and the extreme belief in the afterlife of Christianity.

The assumption of repeated embodiment of the soul also includes the great moral diversity of people, revealing the deeper significance that the Indian caste system still has today as a symbol of a spiritual truth. The castes with their various duties and rights represent the main stages in the development of the soul. The Indians have the word Dharma for the duties and rights that are appropriate for a person at a given stage and with a view to the next higher stage.

The first dharma is that of service. After the savage has developed the lower abilities of the mind in the natural state and has matured to enter civilization, he must learn obedience, submission, and loyalty. Obedience because his power of judgment is not yet developed and so that he can later give orders correctly; loyalty because he must first be tested in small things before he can be entrusted with large things. The dharma of a slave, Çudra, or a mentally dependent person in a serving position is fulfilled when he obeys happily and is found to be loyal. To demand more of him, purity of thought, cheerfulness in suffering, and the strength to endure hardships without complaining, would be unfair. The higher one should show higher virtues, but he has no right to demand them from his subordinates.

If the soul has learned the lessons it can learn at this level in numerous incarnations, it can rise to the next higher level of independent citizen, farmer, capitalist. His dharma is honesty in dealing with people, benevolent, fair treatment of subordinates, perseverance, firmness of character, wisdom, boldness, correct decision-making between conflicting duties, reasonable thrift and wise use of accumulated wealth for noble purposes. The citizen should acquire with energy and spend with wisdom, as the law of development demands.

The dharma of the warrior is courage, brilliant generosity, chivalry, willing sacrifice of life in defense of the weak and in fulfilling one's duty. For him it is right to go to war and kill enemies if his duty of firing lies in this direction. If he falls in battle, well, only the perishable form is broken, but the soul is promoted by this sacrifice and grows to a higher level; it acquires the power of self-sacrifice, learns endurance, strength, steadfast loyalty and devotion to an ideal.

Certainly, war is terrible and we are appalled by the destruction of so many lives, the torments of the wounded and the misery of those left behind, and many philanthropists who only see it from this side deny it any justification. It is indeed difficult to justify it from an earthly, purely material point of view other than with the right of the strongest.

But there are souls in every nation who need the kind of training and discipline that war brings and demands in order to advance, if a weakness is not to remain that hinders progress. War awakens virtues that only war can give. Did not the Japanese, who went to their deaths with enthusiasm, and our brave men in South West Africa present an admirable picture? So much moral strength has been displayed in vain?

I do not believe in eternal peace. This is not to say that nations must constantly fight. They have done that bravely up to now. But it is quite possible that the warlike period will now be followed by one of peace. -

When the soul has processed the experiences of the previous stages and has gained wisdom through obedience, effort and struggle, then comes the lective stage, that of the teacher of humanity as philosopher and priest. His dharma is knowledge, piety, forgiveness. He must not kill, for he is the friend of every creature[55]. He must never feel insulted, never lose control of himself, never act hastily. He should always be friendly, always lead a pure life and detach himself from the things of the world when they dominate him. His goal, the end of his growth, is salvation, holiness.[56]

55 "Abstinence from cruelty is the highest religion" (Bhisma).
56 Besant: Dharma. Bhagavad Gita XVIII.

There are of course many intermediate transitions between these main stages.

The law of the growth of the soul shows the untenability of the socialist phrase about the equality of duties and the relativity of right and wrong. What is right for a person at a lower level can be wrong for someone who is more advanced. In a conditional universe there is neither absolute right nor absolute wrong.[57] Equality before the eyes, which is already questionable in itself, thus appears as a good of dubious value in the light of the moral world order. The stereotypical application of the paragraphs must give way to individual interpretation. Above all, one should not judge undeveloped people too harshly. Much remains to be improved in this respect. -

There is absolutely no contradiction between Christian ethics and Indian metaphysics, and a fusion of the two is desirable because it can give the former a solid foundation, without which even the purest ethics has no motivating power for all those who are still incapable of doing what is good and right for its own sake, even in difficult situations. The Christian belief in immortality has been completely undermined by science, thereby removing the foundation of ethics, and the masses, deprived of trust in religion, which appears to them as a web of lies to reinforce priestly, Junker and capitalist desires for power, are falling more and more into materialism, the obvious consequences of which are anarchy and bestiality.

If there is no immortality and no retribution, morality cannot be justified at all, and it is a ridiculous imposition to demand of a person that he should restrict his pleasures for the sake of others. Rather, for the denier of immortality, the only correct reason is to enjoy life to the fullest, even at the expense of his fellow human beings, and to throw it away as soon as it has nothing more to offer. So when materialists lead a life in the service of charity, even dying for a higher truth, which they should most fear, this proves that something lives in them that is stronger than the calculating mind. This core of being, unconscious to the brain consciousness, must be immortal, since it does not fear death because it does not affect it.

57 For a deeper insight into this complex problem, the above-mentioned short work by Besant is highly recommended.

Even the purest ethics requires a metaphysical foundation that promises reward and punishment and to which the people can adhere. This is what Greek philosophy teaches, whose moral teachings, especially that of the Stoicism, need not fear comparison with the Christian one, but which could not become popular because it was too abstract. Harnack's ethical Christianity, as beautiful and intelligent as it is presented in the well-known text[58], will never become a popular religion because metaphysics is neglected in it. It is suitable for well-fed people who sleep well at night, but not for the weary and burdened who ask: Why do I suffer, why is virtue punished and vice rewarded?

The morally dependent need tangible dogmas which, however, in keeping with advanced knowledge, do not offend reason and have probability on their side. What would be better suited to the support of a religious system than the law of causality, which is based on immutable justice and is also recognized by secular science, and which could also form the basis for the reconciliation of religion and knowledge and would give new strength to the belief in a moral world order, which is already beginning to become a laughing stock for a large part of the population!

This is what India can teach us: that the fate of man does not depend on stupid chance, but that strict legality guides everything and puts everyone in the place that his merits assign him. All grumbling about the apparent injustice of the world disappears before the conviction that inequality of talent and size is only the faithful reflection of inner inequality or level of development. In India this belief has proven itself; should it fail here?

What drives people to social democracy? In other words, the contradiction between theory and practice. Social democracy is the protest of the disinherited against a religion that promises freedom and human dignity but is powerless to fulfill the promise. In no other country has social welfare reached such an extent as in Germany, and the success?

58 The Essence of Christianity.

People are happy when the people multiply,
eat comfortably in their own way,
even educate and teach themselves
and they only raise rebels. Faust II.

The fact that despite all practical social policy, social democracy does not lose its scope - one should not place great hope in the decline in the number of votes in the last Reichstag elections, since the next unfavorable economic situation in industry should more than compensate for the loss - is the best proof that the goal cannot be achieved in this way alone and that intellectual factors are at play which have so far received far too little attention. The material situation of many comrades is not so bad that they have to follow the red flag.

But the quandary of equality plagues people. From the sake of equality of men before God, they conclude that striving for equality of material possessions is a completely just thing, and since the evil bourgeois does not open his purse willingly, they must work towards overthrowing it. Any scruples they may have had about the possibility of a moral world order have been completely dispelled by Büchner, Vogt, Häckel and their associates, who cloaked themselves in the philosophical cloak. So it is no wonder that the blood of the people who now place all emphasis on this world begins to boil at the sight of the bourgeois fattened by the sweat of the workers. But how much worry and effort the entrepreneur has, how his brain is sweating, the worker does not need to know, because it would disturb the circles of the Hessians. One should not be surprised that we have several million social democrats, but that we do not have many more.

The fight against social democracy must take a completely different direction; it must no longer be directed against the symptoms as it has done up to now, but must go deeper and get to the root of the evil. Just as theology, moving along traditional lines and without knowing or wanting to do so, has raised the idea of equality, it will have to systematically eliminate it by its opposite, inequality before God.

This will not happen without a fierce fight, for the resistance to be overcome is

enormous, and new epochs are not born without pain. The 20th century will not be boring. One obstacle of a general nature is the European habits of thought, which the individual can only escape with difficulty. Furthermore, the old faith is associated with many customs and interests, which will only reluctantly allow themselves to be pushed in the new, opposing direction.

The fiercest resistance will probably come from the orthodox clergy, who do not want to have their comfortable Christianity disturbed. Zealots are already directing their attacks against the doctrine of karma, which is evidently gaining too many followers among the educated too quickly, and it is very remarkable that it is precisely the educated circles of the West that are turning in large numbers to Indian wisdom, while our missionaries very rarely, perhaps never, succeed in persuading educated Hindus to accept Christianity. Only the proletarians are prepared to be baptized for a handful of rice, as often as it is requested, which has earned them the derisive name of "rice Christians." The educated, on the other hand, cling so faithfully to their doctrine that it will probably only disappear from the soil of India with the last Brahmin. Religion and philosophy are still great powers in India, says Max Müller, and philosophy does not fight religion, but rather perfects it.[59]

The reconciliation of religion and philosophy, hopelessly sought by the best minds in Europe, has long been a reality in India. But it is only possible on the basis of the law of causality, of whose validity for the moral and intellectual sphere the educated Indians are completely convinced. Where religion is philosophical and philosophy is religious, there is hardly any danger that secular science will become dangerous to religion, and no reactionary minister of religion needs to pass laws to gag freedom of thought. while in the West both are at loggerheads with each other, to the delight of the malicious mob, which plays one off against the other and now claims the truth for its philosophy of the most banal materialism and for its cult of the crudest hedonism.

But neither orthodoxy nor materialism will be able to withstand the triumph of

59 M. Müller: India in its world-historical significance. 215. 210.

Indian wisdom, even if a century passes before it is finally recognized. Thinking people find in it precisely what the currently dominant schools of thought cannot give: a profound philosophy and, above all, a satisfactory explanation of the apparent injustice of earthly conditions, and anyone who has once been seized by the magic of the doctrine of karma will never let go, he is lost to the Church and to materialism.

The tormenting question of the cause of the diversity of human destinies will greatly promote the penetration of the doctrine of karma into the consciousness of the European peoples. But another factor, from which one would least expect it, could also be active in this direction: Rome! If the Pope, by virtue of his infallibility, incorporates it into the dogma structure of the Catholic Church, from that moment on it will be a sacred document for the believing Catholic. It is still to be assumed that the statesmen in the Vatican do not know it, but that can easily change overnight, and it would be a very low opinion of the papal statesmanship, which has hitherto been so well versed in its own interests, if one were to think that it would not make use of such a good means of consolidating its rule and of eliminating much social discontent. The Pope will also know how to reconcile the doctrine of karma with the dogmas of the Catholic Church.

The general view among Protestants is that papal infallibility in spiritual matters is presumptuous and nonsense, but in practice the situation is somewhat different. Is it quite inconceivable that Pius IX, recognizing the need for reform in Catholicism, quietly created the tool that would make reform possible? For now the Pope can intervene in the structure of the Church to transform it without coming into conflict with the past; he can introduce improvements that would simply be impossible without the dogma of infallibility. The fact that this has not happened so far is no proof of what will happen in the future. The "everything is in flux" also applies to Rome, and the Vatican will have to think about reforms in the interest of self-preservation.

The first step has already been taken, and the danger that threatens Protestantism has already become acute. The well-known personal physician of the Pope, Professor Lapponi, recently published a work with the highest approval (!): Ipnotismo e

Spiritismo, studio medico-critico (Hypnotism and Spiritism, a medical-critical study), which is being read diligently in the Vatican and is attracting great attention.

Lapponi emphasizes in his remarks that he is striving to reconcile science with faith, because one can no longer deny that there are beings who have reached a higher spiritual state after death, who can communicate with people and cause astonishing phenomena at their request.

While Lapponi, on the basis of his own research, has completely adopted the viewpoint of Lombroso, Schiaparelli, Zöllner and Crookes and openly supports spiritualism, which had previously been denounced as devilish, he has made it acceptable in the Vatican and overthrown the demonological hypothesis.

The consequences of this change in the Vatican's view can hardly be indicated for the time being. The belief in immortality, previously a theorem, an unproven assertion of moral philosophers, is given a firm boost by the testimony of men of science, the Church can justify morality and vigorously reject attacks on the belief in immortality.

That is the pleasant side of the matter. The unpleasant side would be that the beings from the afterlife, on whose testimony we rely, could give information that would relegate the eternal hell and eternal heaven claimed by the Church to the realm of fable. This would force the Church to look for a substitute, to transfer the retribution, if it cannot take place in the afterlife, back to this world, which would only be possible under the premise of reincarnation. From belief in life after death to belief in reincarnation is therefore only a small step, which, incidentally, is also prompted by simple philosophical consideration.

The extremely conservative leading circles of the Catholic Church will not decide to make such radical changes to the doctrinal structure so quickly or lightly, but they will not be spared, for the consequences are too clear and the needs of the Church are growing too much for the old state of affairs to last much longer.

Pius X is not as shrewd a politician as his predecessor and will not be as rich in external successes, but perhaps he is called upon to strengthen Catholicism from within.

He is helped in this by the fact that Catholicism has preserved the mystical element far more than Protestantism, which has always been abused by the priesthood, but which no religion can completely do without unless it wants to give up an important means of attracting the masses. Liberal Protestantism, on the other hand, is almost more materialistic than natural science, which is committed to skepticism, because the latter recognizes mystical and occult phenomena in its most distinguished representatives, while Harnack still says: "But of all attempts to establish the certainty of immortality through evidence, the poet's saying applies: You must believe, you must dare, because the gods do not lend as collateral."[60]

If the Catholic Church has an advantage over Protestantism through the preservation of the mystical element and the power vested in the Pope, this advantage is more than compensated for by the higher racial value and greater spiritual freedom of the Germanic peoples, so that it is difficult to say which of the two churches will experience its Reformation first.

In any case, the Vatican is showing, by the fact that it is turning its attention to spiritualism, that it is somewhat ahead of the slow-moving Protestant theologians in its insight into what is of benefit to the Church in the fight against unbelief and materialism. For it is not the question of whether spiritualism contains a greater or lesser degree of truth (I consider the theory of fraud to be excluded until proven otherwise by such conscientious researchers as those mentioned, who certainly do not put their scientific reputation at risk lightly), but rather that it has restored the belief in immortality to millions of people. Therein lies its strength and its moral justification. Providence also uses error to achieve its purposes, and it does not always send humanity what is true, but what is necessary for it to learn and experience this or that. The redemption of mankind through the blood of Christ is, in our opinion, a sad error, democratic equality a fraud without equal, but both undoubtedly serve higher purposes.

If we were given the opportunity to survey a larger period of human development

60 Essence of Christianity. 103.

or the whole of it, we would recognize it as reasonable, just as the traveler from a high vantage point finds the winding paths of the plain to be planned and expedient. Therefore, we must not allow ourselves to be deterred in the pursuit of a goal that we recognize as right, even when the path appears to take us away from the goal.

Thus, during the Middle Ages, a period of metaphysical and religious darkness had to come so that the Europeans, turning away from the supernatural and eternal and completely devoted to the sensuous and temporal, could begin the conquest of the earth and the exploration and servitude of the forces of nature, something that would have been impossible for the Brahmins, who lived exclusively by philosophy and religion, since they were striving in the completely opposite direction. Simply criticizing evil materialism does not improve anything; it must be seen as a necessary stage in the development of humanity, but not as the goal and end of development.

In the same way, church Christianity, despite its mistakes, has done and continues to do educational work on humanity, and its democratizing tendency may well have had the secret purpose of thoroughly stirring up European humanity so that a new race with new abilities could emerge from the mush to establish a new culture. I do not consider this goal to have been achieved by any means, but we are only at the beginning of a new culture. -

Protestantism must not waste its energy in hair-splitting and must not wait until Rome forces it into battle. Rather, it should renew Luther's example, create new viable forms by eliminating outdated dogmas and unite Christian ethics with Brahmanical metaphysics. The present is not unfavorable for such a beginning, since a deep religious yearning, a search for new spiritual ideals and values, is running through humanity and metaphysics is gaining ground every day, despite the ridicule that is spread by materialistic enlightenment ravens. Even in science, a more tolerant understanding of the basis of all religion, the belief in immortality, is taking shape. The wonderful phenomena of radioactivity have dealt a fatal blow to massive materialism, and the substance law that seemed so unshakable is beginning to falter dangerously. “The law of the

conservation of matter is only a special case of the law of the conservation of force. "[61]

That there are not only chemical and physical forces, but also mental forces, which are essentially different and completely independent of the former, is shown by hypnotism, which forms the gateway to the land of mysticism, i.e. the still unknown natural science, and it is only a question of time before the scholars will have to give up their fundamental resistance to the belief in immortality. But then the way will be clear for religious renewal and theologians will be faced with the decision of whether to steer Protestantism completely towards the abyss or whether to rejuvenate it by cleverly steering it into new paths.

In the lectern case, the Church could certainly count on the return of many educated, deeply religious people who feel repelled by the current dogmas, and it would have nothing to fear for its present belief. Anyone who still believes in the dogmas of the Church today will also accept the doctrine of karma if it is authoritatively proclaimed to him, because the repeated embodiment is no more wonderful and incredible than the one-time one.

Incidentally, the idea of repeated embodiments of the soul is not far from European thought. Outstanding thinkers have clearly spoken out in favor of it. G. Bruno says:

> The soul never perishes, but rather the former dwelling place
> It exchanges it for a new place and lives and works in it.
> Everything changes, but nothing perishes.[62]

Kant taught the pre- and post-existence of the soul[63], from which reincarnation follows automatically, and Schopenhauer, who certainly did not praise hastily, called the Vedas the fruit of the highest human knowledge and wisdom and the Upanishads the greatest gift of the century.[64]

Seiling[65] has written a book about Goethe's position on the belief in immortality,

61 Supplement to the Allg. Ztg. 1904. No. 198.
62 Della causa (Wagner) I. 243.
63 Kant's lectures on psychology, edited by du Prel. 75. 76. 79.
64 Works I. 457.
65 Seiling: Goethe and Materialism.

which is also a sharp rejection of Häckel, who believes he can cover his newly-expressed materialism with statements by the great man of Weimar.

With the intuition of genius, Goethe paints a picture of human life as Indian wisdom imagines it in the wonderful Ode:

The human soul
Is like water:
It comes from heaven,
It rises to heaven,
And back down again
It must return to earth,
Eternally changing.

And further:

After eternal, honorable,
Great Laws
Do we all have to
Our existence
Completing circles.

Buddha could have spoken like this.

Schiller says:

No one has yet escaped the fate imposed

and he sums up a basic idea of Brahmanic philosophy in these succinct sentences:

Life is not the greatest of goods,
But guilt is the greatest of evils.

We Europeans are well on the way to completely reversing this established relationship: to value life highly and guilt low, to which a good part of our moral defects can undoubtedly be traced.

Of recent writers who support palingenesis, I will only mention L. v. Hellenbach[66]. In the first volume of his "Prejudices", this noble philosopher and philanthropist makes very good suggestions for solving the social question, which would significantly improve the situation of all citizens in the foreseeable future, without restricting personal

66 Prejudices of Humanity II. 175.

freedom like the socialist coercive state. The struggle that is indispensable for progress would not stop, but it would lose much of its cruelty and the poor and the poorest would also have an interest in maintaining order.

It is therefore not only the fault of philosophy that the reconciliation of faith and knowledge is still pending.

The germs and beginnings of a new religious life are abundant in the Protestant Church. The way in which liberal theologians deal with the Holy Scripture, criticize the person of the Redeemer, even doubt his existence, the inner apostasy of many clergymen from the Apostles Creed, the doubtful spirit that numerous young clergymen bring with them into office, are just as much proof that the dogma structure is crumbling at every joint and that only existential considerations are the inner long since apostates still have to remain silent and tolerate.

Waiting is the best tactic for these dissatisfied people. The individual who wanted to fight against the thorns would fail miserably today, when Orthodoxy has the upper hand. He would sacrifice himself not without glory, but without reward for the whole. Since the consistories still hold power, it would be foolish to challenge power. Cunning against force. Dissatisfaction must continue to grow in secret until the yoke can be thrown off at the right opportunity. In the meantime, however, the clergy, who are tired of the shackles of the apostles' creed, should come closer together and organize themselves so that they form a power that can command respect. Above all, however, they should create a foundation for the apostles' creed and not limit themselves to a purely ethical Christianity, to which the people will always be cool. Only when the Bhagavad Gita, the Upanishads[67], the speeches of Buddha[68] and other pearls of Indian thought, as well as the works of the Christian mystics, have earned their right to be heard on pulpits alongside the beautiful Gospel of John, when the wisdom of our poets is no longer caviar for the people, but is accessible to them in its religious content, when evangelical Christianity has experienced its renewal from the Aryan spirit: only then can

67 Translated by Prof. P. Deußen.
68 Translated by Dr. K. Neumann.

the German people hope to end the unfortunate schism in the church that is paralyzing its best forces.

Not only faith and knowledge, but also the evangelical and Catholic churches can most easily be reconciled on the basis of the doctrine of karma. This basis is neutral for both. If both parties honestly seek the truth, they must necessarily reach the same goal with the help of philosophy, starting from the same premises. Differences in worship may remain, since the sensual nature of the Romans loves pomp, but people will no longer fight furiously over external appearances; they have more important things to do.

Since we are so poor that we have to borrow our need for religious ideas from abroad, we should at least turn to where the stream of religious knowledge flows deepest and purest. Not that we should accept it uncritically. We want to use our criticism. But even after we have eliminated the unsuitable, there will still be enough of the good left that we will experience enormous enrichment and our pulpit speakers will not be at a loss for new material for at least a century. For it is not only the directly new that enriches us, but also the fact that our previous possession of religious values appears in a new light, appears in new relationships, makes it greater and more valuable. Unfortunately, our theologians have hardly any idea of the intellectual treasures that are there for them to exploit. Moreover, they are so monoided and held in deeply rutted tracks by the one-sided Judaizing tendency of Christianity that breaking with traditional views costs them a considerable effort.

When Luther called the spirits to battle, he was able to point them to the gospel as a reliable guide. Today, however, there is still no banner around which people can rally. The principle: each one his own high priest! is very nice in theory, but it can only apply to those who are morally independent and has the additional disadvantage that it splits up forces. Troops without leadership and without a goal cannot impress an enemy who is advancing in unison. In fact, the opponents of orthodoxy are in this situation, and before they attack, they should organize their forces and bring clarity to their efforts, otherwise they could have unpleasant experiences. They cannot count on the active help of the

state. As much as the state is interested in the emergence of religious views that satisfactorily explain social inequality and thereby enable the different social groups to live peacefully side by side, it can only indirectly encourage the efforts aimed at this by recognizing them and protecting their supporters from the wrath of their opponents. But even this passive help is doubtful, as the Old Catholics can tell us.

Since the King of Prussia, who unfortunately is also the supreme bishop of the Protestant Church, believes that he must turn to Orthodoxy for political reasons, albeit more out of necessity than his own desires, there is no longer any hope of a free development of religion from this side. The King is, however, in a difficult situation. Since the anti-Reich groups in the nursery in the Wallothaus are abandoning him in his efforts to protect the Reich against external enemies, he must take help wherever he can find it and pay for it with concessions to the punks.

Assuming that Rome should one day follow the path outlined above, what can the Protestant Church oppose it with? Dependence on the state, an ethics that is floating in the air, an outdated belief in immortality and the dubious value of a critical criticism of the Bible. This means that it cannot hold its own against an overpowering, well-organized opponent who refutes his belief in immortality with scientific evidence, and in the twentieth century it will have to be liquidated despite the undeniable, great religious need because it has given too much space to doubt and knowledge and is now unable to banish the spirits it has summoned.

Since, on the one hand, it lacks the means of power that Catholicism has for training the mind, and, on the other hand, it has entered the slippery slope of criticism of its foundation, it is not clear how this self-destruction can come to a halt. The Protestant theologians should not have entered the path of criticism at all if they were not determined to pursue it to the end and did not know what they could offer in return. Now that it has happened, the slogan can only be: Onward and through! New life blossoms from the ruins!

Since the masses cannot return to naive church belief, there is only one way for

Protestantism to be saved: it must force itself to become a religion of knowledge in order to win over the intelligentsia. When Luther broke away from Rome, he had to found the church on faith, because pure knowledge, which could have served as a foundation, did not yet exist. But now the time has come to transform the religion of feeling and belief into a clear religion of knowledge. If, for this purpose, I recommend that Protestantism return to the Indians after having followed the Jews for so long, with perhaps disgruntled urgency, this is justified by the fact that none of the great religions in question can meet the demands that reason is entitled to make as well as the Indian one.

By adopting Indian metaphysics, Europe would by no means be transformed into a penitential institution, for the energetic, masculine spirit of the Teutonic race will always prefer active love to renunciatory quietism and contemplative asceticism. On European soil, Indian wisdom will bear different, but no worse, fruits than on the Indus and Ganges.

Religions of faith always require the stultification of the masses, because faith, by its nature, cannot bear harsh criticism. Enlightenment is only compatible with a religion of knowledge. Western natural science will not make any Brahmin waver in his religious views; rather, these thinkers will soon discover that the results of our knowledge are more likely to strengthen their views than to alienate them from them.

And Christianity must become aristocratic again, as it was in the time of the Gnostics, then the plebeianization of humanity would come to an end. Aristocracy is a world principle from which even Christianity cannot escape without serious disadvantage. The egalitarian doctrine cannot be condemned more harshly than by the words of the master: You shall know them by their fruits! This becomes all the clearer when one compares it with aristocratic Brahmanism with its beneficial consequences for the Indian social order. The difference is so striking that there can be no doubt as to which direction the development will take.

Since learned theology has interpreted the parable of the workers in the vineyard in a non-democratic sense, since we know the Gnostics' view of the same subject and

furthermore know that Pauline justification by faith is only a forced product of circumstances, the main obstacles to the aristocratization of Christianity have been removed, so that the reinterpretation of the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount cannot cause any difficulties.

As I said, Christianity was already aristocratic at the time of the Gnostics, and this view was so widespread that the Church saw its main enemy not in paganism but in Gnosticism.[69] The struggle lasted three centuries and ended with a victory for the Church, but by means that history rightly condemns. Shouldn't what was possible then be possible today, and all the more so since the teachings of the Brahmins are incomparably clearer and simpler than the extremely complicated systems of the Gnostics, and people are actually demanding a more spiritual understanding of Christianity?

To the extent that religion is ridiculed so that it can be understood even by the simpletons, thinkers will withdraw from it, and the struggle will be unavoidable if religion demands that thinkers recognize its shallow dogmas. Instead of the simple following the wise, the wise should adapt themselves to the simple - that is, in a nutshell, the tragedy of dogmatic Christianity, which must destroy it. And it was prepared for this reversal of circumstances because it only wanted salvation for all sects and only one existence that prepared for salvation. Because it made no distinctions and was thirsty to make sure that everyone should be saved in the same way, it came into hopeless conflict with the harsh reality, and the more it incurred the hostility of the thinkers, the more it had to rely on the ignorant - no blessing for either side.

All these evils and their attendant phenomena will disappear if religion recognizes the diversity of people and allows each soul to find salvation in its own way through repeated incarnations. The doctrine of reincarnation is decidedly aristocratic, for it recognizes differences, calls the wise and capable to rule and puts the incapable and undeveloped in their place, without depriving them of the prospect of progress and

69 Schmidt: Gnostic writings in Coptic. Foreword.

higher development.[70] Anyone who thinks this through will find the peaceful development of Indian culture and the stability of the Indian social order understandable.

I expressly object to the suggestion that I intend to uncritically recommend the imitation of Indian customs and conditions. We are a different race with a different past, live in a different climate and under different circumstances and have different goals and tasks than the Indians and should not even think of simply copying them. Nevertheless, it would be very foolish to reject the good that they can give us, because our conditions are not yet such that they could not be better, and we are not yet so wise that we have nothing more to learn. So when I suggest that our statesmen, philosophers and theologians adopt some basic ideas of Indian wisdom, this is nothing more than an attempt to bring theory and practice into harmony, to find a theory that corresponds to the actual differences between people. If anyone knows something better that has also passed the test of practice, I would be happy to be instructed by him. In any case, something generous must be done; the policy of small means, of living from hand to mouth, has not proven successful.

But one should not think that one can ignore a factor as powerful in the life of nations as religion in the improvement of the social order. The religious need is ineradicable, since it is rooted in the metaphysical core of man. When the mob abolished the old faith in the great revolution, it made pure reason its idol, choosing a frivolous woman as its symbol - it had to have something to worship. And the enlightened comrades believe in Marx and Bebel just as stiff and firmly as the mountain farmer

70 This view of life can make the solution of the native question in our colonies much easier for us. There are three ways to achieve this solution. The natives are exterminated. That would be foolish and cruel, because the natives, especially the Negroes, are a valuable workforce that we should not eliminate unless absolutely necessary and that in some areas makes the cultivation of the land possible in the first place. Or the natives are treated as equals to the whites and given the same rights as them. That would lead to similarly unpleasant conditions to those that are causing the Yankees so much headaches. So there is only the third way: to subordinate the colored people to the whites and assign them a subordinate position.

Religion must take this relationship into account. It is not equality that must be proclaimed to the Negro, but gradual development through the series of reincarnations. Since it is impossible to have a supervisor for each of the colored guys, their own conscience must be appointed as a guardian; Given the great influence that religious ideas have on the minds of primitive people, we can use this force to work for good, just as it can work evil through ignorance.

Unfortunately, the missionaries have, through the doctrine of equality, unwittingly contributed their fair share to making the Negroes rebellious, and it is very doubtful whether this mistake can ever be made right.

It goes without saying that a caste system appropriate to the circumstances must be introduced, for only this can permanently secure the whites' dominance.

believes in his saints. You can see what happens when the mob creates its own gods.

Many expect salvation from the next war. Well, the war will come, but even if it ends well for us and revives the noble instincts for a moment, if they still exist, we will soon be back in the same place if we do not make a fundamental change in our religious views. This realization may be painful, but serious illnesses require heroic means.

Nor can we hope to convert a revolutionary comrade into a conservative with a religious system, even the best one. Hatred has eaten too deeply, and we must always reckon with the possibility that the tension that has been building up for decades will erupt in terrible political and economic catastrophes, catastrophes that will seriously damage the middle class, but will hit the industrial proletariat with full force and teach it that it is not the urban proletariat, which is free from all accidents, but a healthy middle class that forms the most reliable basic element of the state, and that it is not empty socialist phrases but iron laws that rule the world.

But if we ignore the revolution and assume that things will continue to develop calmly, social democracy, which has gradually developed as a result of an error, will gradually die out under the influence of a better world view. The world will never become democratic, even if the aristocratic principle may be temporarily obscured. The world could not exist if irrationality came to power. The comrades' terrorism, for its part, ensures that the manly elements who do not want to bow to mob rule, which is where social democracy is heading, will unite in a united defense.

Whether this process of dying out will take place quickly or slowly depends entirely on the behavior of the educated and leading circles. Given the many different opinions that are opposed to one another here, any prediction is a risky undertaking.

Perhaps our continent is not destined for a moral and religious rebirth at all; perhaps it is destined to move towards a slow, fatal stagnation through an unbearable leveling out of all differences, which knows no other goal than the most even satiation of all its members, while renouncing higher interests, and that America or Africa are chosen as the stage for new forms of culture, while Europe, like the Moor who has done

his duty, must step aside. Europe has too many people and too many laws; there is no room, no freedom for the new, the emerging, which lends itself to a thousand interests; it is suffocated by the weeds of the old.

* * *

A hypothesis is all the more useful and comes closer to the truth the simpler it is and the more problems it explains. If we apply this to the racial questions that have been discussed with such passionate interest in recent decades, we can say that racial theories explain many phenomena, but also leave some, and one of the most profound, unexplained, such as genius. This is where the theory fails. No racial theory, however sophisticated, is capable of shedding light on the mystery of a moral giant like Buddha or an intellectual genius like Goethe. All we know for sure is that genius only ever appears in the white race and never in the colored race, who are therefore also characterized as inferior by this circumstance. The heredity theory also fails, for it is precisely this that is strange: the ancestors, siblings and descendants of the man of genius usually do not rise above the average. The anthropologists, realizing the inadequacy of their efforts, have tacitly given up on an explanation of genius.

The principle that explanatory principles should not be increased without necessity loses its validity when a problem cannot be solved with known means. Then one not only may, but must resort to new hypotheses if they promise a solution. In doing so, one must ensure that there is no residue on the side of the problem, but that the hypothesis itself is not too big either. The hypothesis must fit the problem like a well-made tailor-made suit.

If anthropologists could overcome their aversion to the belief in immortality and decide to apply the theory of reincarnation to genius - initially only as a useful working hypothesis - they would not only completely solve this problem, but also eliminate various other inconsistencies which have attracted bitter enemies to the young science of racial studies.

This explains, for example, that gifted minds appear where all favorable

preconditions are lacking, and that "classy" people are sometimes mindless, nothing but race. But genius is essentially a highly developed soul that incarnates among less advanced people in order to proclaim new truths or to promote development in other ways.

Of the objections that are raised against this explanation, the most important is that racial theory will lose a lot of its value through the inevitable shift of emphasis to the psychic realm. This concern is unfounded, because racial science is only freed from problems that it is not capable of dealing with anyway. The concept of "race" fully encompasses only the external human being, but only partially the intellectual. True genius rises above the limitations of race, it is international and belongs to all of humanity.

While according to the pure racial theory, man is the product of race and environment, if a spiritual principle is assumed, he appears as the resultant of two forces: the organizing soul and organized matter. To speak figuratively, the soul is in the position of a builder who must take the nature of the material into account when constructing a building. Accordingly, the qualities of the soul are rarely, perhaps never, expressed in their pure form in the external appearance, but are always inhibited, influenced, and changed by the properties of the matter, the more so the stronger the soul and the more pliable the plasma, and the less so the weaker the soul and the more brittle the plasma. This interaction of soul and matter, in which now one part, now the other, is more prominent, explains the great diversity of characters with relative racial stability.

Therefore, all racial purity is always only relative, because the plasma is constantly subject to a spiritual influence. Nevertheless, it is not pointless, because here too the law of attraction of the same applies. Noble souls will always need a refined material.

Pure breeding increases and strengthens certain characteristics of the plasma and allows others to atrophy, and is necessary and indispensable where a sharply defined type with special abilities is to be bred, be it a statesman, warrior, merchant or

something else.

The Jews give us the most instructive example of what racial breeding can achieve. Oppressed and persecuted for centuries, living mostly in hardship and poverty, under conditions that would be disastrous for other peoples, they reveal an astonishing resilience and constancy of racial character, and even if the characteristics they developed under such circumstances are predominantly negative and not very pleasant for other peoples, they still have the merit of upholding the principle of separation in the midst of a general frenzy of fraternization and mixing and of showing us its value. What guided them in this - instinct, arrogance, antipathy towards other peoples, the simple and yet so powerful belief that Yahweh would grant them world domination - is less important than the fact that they can serve as a model of how races can be bred even under difficult conditions if the firm will to do so is present.

"Race is everything, and every race that carelessly gives its blood to mixing must perish," said the Jew Disraeli, who thereby gave a succinct and unmistakable interpretation of the profound legend of the Eternal Jew.

In contrast to this open admission, it seems almost comical when the circumcised leaders of the Social Democrats proclaim the equality of all people and the insignificance of race, but at the same time strictly follow the first law of racial breeding, segregation. This is how fools are caught. While the German Michel gets drunk on the generously given sugar of equality and is still proud of being able to throw himself away to other peoples, the Jew does not even think of stepping out of his segregation, knowing full well that he would thereby bring about his own downfall. The Jew is first a Jew, whatever language he speaks, and then, when it suits him, a Frenchman, an Englishman, German. So there are German Jews, but no Jewish Germans.

The Jews obviously do not like the discussion of racial issues because they see it as an exposure of the reason for their rule. For Yahweh would not have given them world domination if they had not brought the best to it: an unshakable belief in

achieving the goal and keeping their blood pure.

It is not to be assumed that the Jews had in mind the breeding of a race from the beginning of their separation; religious zeal and the desire to be the chosen people were completely sufficient to isolate them. The many legal regulations also made separation very favorable. Once the type had become sufficiently established, tribulation and hardship could no longer harm them; in fact, they seemed to thrive all the better, and only time will tell whether the luxury life to which they now devote themselves is not more damaging to them than oppression. At least neurasthenia is already very widespread among them.

Jews and Brahmins, these complete opposites within the white race, the one as extremely materialistic as the other extremely spiritualistic, almost demand comparison, but I will content myself with emphasizing what they have in common, the separation carried out with unheard-of tenacity, which allows the Brahmins to look back on a history of almost five thousand years, and the Jews on two and a half thousand years.

Salvation lies in wise separation.

Anxious concern for the future of the German people fills the hearts of the best, and the means recommended for the improvement of the race are countless, and some are also eagerly propagated. But since they are all aimed at the physical improvement of the race, they do not get to the heart of the matter. The strongest bodies and the strongest fists are of little help if they are not guided by a refined brain.

If we want to hold our own in the struggle for existence with the Slavs, who are formidable because of their numbers and lack of needs, and with the Anglo-Slavs, who are in a much better position, we must place more emphasis on quality and not rely on numbers alone. We must do as the Jews do and also breed race, i.e. exclude all incompetent people from the choice of spouses and let the capable ones marry each other - at the risk of creating a new caste with privileges, real advantages of birth.

A privileged caste is not in itself a disadvantage for a people, but it becomes so when it forgets that privileges must be balanced by higher duties, when it turns its

position into a lazy bed and abuses it to gain lower advantages. It is not the least of the Brahmins' credits that they voluntarily renounced wealth and external honors and by doing so escaped many reproaches, and that, as even the historian Weber, who is very cool towards them, admits, they took their duties very seriously throughout.

If we are serious about breeding humanity to a higher level (and I believe that we can certainly use a little refinement), we must familiarize ourselves with the idea of caste breeding - this only understood as the exclusion of the inferior, all other means only lead to the goal by a long detour, if at all.

The conditions here are at least as favorable as in America. The racial mixture of the Germans is good. The elements which came together in it were different enough to have a fertilizing and stimulating effect on one another, and yet sufficiently similar to avoid in the products of the cross that excess and discord of character which usually accompany the mixing of contradictory and incompatible components. A people which has produced so many first-rate thinkers in all fields; in which, despite the overgrowth of material interests, a great deal of idealism still lives; whose sons know how to die like heroes - I recall the sinking of the "Illis" in the Yellow Sea - or whose sons know how to defeat a cunning, cruel enemy in the African deserts in heroic, silent fulfillment of duty and with unheard-of efforts: such a people can hope for a glorious future as soon as they reflect on the means that guarantee it. We must not trust in blind fate. We must take the shaping of our future into our own hands with holy seriousness and clear intentions, so that we can rightly inherit the legacy of our ancestors and leave it enriched to our grandchildren.

After political, economic and religious liberalism has unleashed and unfortunately also dispersed and wasted forces, it is now necessary to gather them together and make them useful for the refinement of the race. Several circumstances favor this.

There is still a great deal of caste spirit in the people, which only needs to be guided in the right direction in order to bring about good. The Jews form a caste of the strictest kind, not a professional caste, but a racial caste, and if one did not know the

deeper reason, one might find it strange that the rabid socialist press only ever goes to war against the aristocratic caste, but never against the Jewish caste. The Jews are a caste, whether they want to admit it or not, since the term caste means nothing other than segregation, regardless of the reasons for it, and it is very absurd that the Jew Nordau[71] rails against the "aristocratic lie" while confusing aristocratic and noble. What is right for the Jews is right for the nobility.

The peasant class is both a professional and racial caste, and the fact that it gives its surplus members to other classes does not change this. In recent times, the organization of the classes has progressed to such an extent that it is no longer individuals against individuals, but groups against groups. Even social democracy cannot escape this trend, since it, which abhors class, constantly exhorts the "class-conscious" proletariat to unity.

So long as society is still differentiated, the same will always come together, and complaining about the caste mentality is pointless and absurd, because the natural state is not equality but difference. But if people come together out of natural kinship and community of interests, why not also for one of the highest purposes, the ennoblement of the race?

At first only the nobility and the upper middle classes come into question. The custom of the nobility to marry only within their caste is generally regarded as a prejudice based on arrogance, which is no longer justified in the present day. But even if it must be admitted that in many cases the custom has no practical use, and that the nobility itself hardly knows the actual purpose of this custom, perhaps never knew it, the situation was different in the past. At that time, when the difference between the noble landowner, the descendant of the warlike, blond Germanic tribes, and his serfs, the half-breed of a semi-animal primal race, was still obvious, the nobility found themselves in a similar situation to that of the Yankees today, who reject brotherhood with the Negro.

The custom has survived to this day, albeit in a weakened form and for entirely

71 The conventional lies of civilized humanity.

different reasons. As long as it serves only material interests, with the undisguised purpose of preserving privileges and advantages, it is extremely questionable and often downright amusing. Since the breeding purpose is no longer recognizable anywhere and equality has become a farce and a mere question of law through the arbitrary bestowal of nobility, one really cannot blame the people if they no longer want to know anything about such fictitious privileges, and "unrestful" inheritance disputes between high houses will always provide the newspapers with a welcome target for satirical missiles.

Today, the nobility is often just a hollow dignity. If it wants to regain meaning, it must return to its original concept, to the breeding intention. The form is still there and only needs to be filled with new life. The Junkers take the greatest care in breeding cattle and horses in order to produce these worthy creatures in the highest perfection, but the creation of their own offspring is usually left to chance, no wonder that there are so many zeros among the feudal lords. It is only thanks to the strict house rules of some families that the nobility is still at a reasonable level. But how long will that last, and even the better noble families succumb to the influences of the spirit of the times.

That should change. The nobility must not be content with living well and badly and enjoying life comfortably (fructus consumere natus), but must feel the ambition to distinguish themselves through efficiency and to act as an example in order to make up for the sins of their ancestors against the German people. Just as the warrior caste of the Japanese samurai became an incalculable blessing to the country through an exemplary lifestyle, our nobility should see a similarly high goal. Schiller describes the essence of true nobility very beautifully with the words:

> There are only two virtues, if they were always united:
> goodness is always great, greatness is always good!

The nobility will, however, first have to train itself to be a role model[72]; it still has to get rid of various bad habits and is still far from what it could be with good will and the means that its position provides it. It must also avoid the appearance of wanting to

72 A text that is truly aristocratic in spirit is: Graevell: Aryavarta.

use its privileged position to satisfy its greed for material pleasure. This is why it must have the greatest simplicity of life, which at the same time protects against many sensual temptations and is also otherwise beneficial to the physical human being, quite apart from the effect on the spiritual. Today, when an energetic middle class is entering the scene as a competitor, the nobility can only say: rule in order to serve! Rule in the service of the fatherland, for the good of the whole! Goethe could not think of a more worthy end for Faust, who was not satisfied with all earthly trinkets and who demanded from the earth every highest pleasure and from heaven the most beautiful stars, than to let him end his days as a cultural engineer in the service of humanity. A nobility filled with such a spirit will be left unchallenged with the privileges that are today being attacked from all sides.

That the idea of equality is the mortal enemy of all racial breeding requires no special proof. Anyone who wants to be more than the others always runs the risk of abandoning the principle of mediocrity that is so dear to orthodox democracy, and in relation to the religious side: what is the point of breeding outstanding people when all are equal before God, when even the best only attains a level of bliss that is also attainable by the mediocre and inferior? The dogma of equality is the reversal of all healthy relationships; it weighs like lead on all development and cannot easily be fought too zealously.

The refinement of the race is of course not a privilege of the nobility. If I expect it from them in particular, it is because of the prestige they still enjoy and because they still have enough moral strength to make an appeal to the "noblesse oblige" not seem hopeless. Nothing prevents the bourgeoisie from participating in racial breeding. We do not yet have an abundance of noble people. If the constitutional-democratic system will have outlived itself in the not too distant future, as the monarchical-aristocratic system has at present, then there must be men born of a new spirit to be able to take over the design and leadership of the social-aristocratic state.

If marriages within the caste were presented above as arising from an originally

entirely reasonable intention and approved with regard to the breeding purpose, this isolation need not degenerate into a sticking to principles. Only the incompetent should be kept away, but the capable, the good, must be guaranteed a rise to the upper caste.

Now, cheap advice on selection is easier to give than to carry out. Love, the dreadful lucre and other interests will all too often form insurmountable obstacles at the beginning, so that little of the beautiful theory will remain. Nevertheless, the idea of racial breeding must remain alive; it will then gain strength and bear fruit on its own.

Where circumstances do not permit the following of the breeding principle by means of selection, there is still another way open. There is a time when the character is still soft and malleable like wax, when bad characteristics can be reduced and eliminated, and good ones can be developed and strengthened. This is the time before birth. Carl du Prel has dealt with this type of pedagogy in a short, ingenious work[73], which I would like to recommend, so that it is unnecessary to go into details here.

A terrible enemy of human breeding is alcoholism, which is responsible for the degeneration of humanity to a terrible extent. Of course, not every glass of wine is necessarily harmful, but there are circumstances which make strict abstinence a duty. Since alcohol poisons the germ cells (Forel), it should be avoided during the reproductive period. Children and young people, whose nerve cells are still developing, should also live abstinent lives.

Kräpelin and his students have used ingenious methods to establish the detrimental effect of even small doses of alcohol on mental activity.[74] It is then understandable that children conceived while drunk reveal physical and mental inferiority and bear the stigma for their entire lives that they owe their existence to the

---

73 du Prel: Prenatal education as a means of human breeding. A contribution to the solution of the social question. Jena 1899.

74 2) A. Smith: Alcohol and intellectual work.

Incidentally, by taking a decisive stance against the consumption of alcohol, the Social Democrats could brilliantly demonstrate their humanity and sincerity and at the same time deal a heavy blow to the hated capitalism. But this is precisely where the deceitfulness of the party leaders is revealed in the best light. The worker who lives a life of abstinence and uses the money he would otherwise sacrifice for alcohol for healthy, hearty food and better housing and buys a few good books could easily become so clever that he sees through the hollowness of the socialist phrases and turns his back on the phrasemongers. That must not happen, of course, which is why the leaders do everything they can to thwart the discussion of the alcohol question at the party congresses, and hence the hopeless fear of reforms in general.

outburst of animal lust. This has little meaning for people who spend their lives in lowliness, but it can be disastrous for individuals as well as for nations and states if people in responsible positions, judges, military officers, ministers, princes, walk the difficult-to-recognize borderline of the pathological under the influence of alcohol. Lost battles, diplomatic failures, tropical fever, and princes' imbecility have their ultimate cause in a bottle of wine far more often than one could imagine. The monarchy of the future stands and falls with the quality of the princes. If they do not practice kalogeny and ensure healthy, capable offspring, the days of divine grace will be numbered. -

Of course, even perfect racial breeding does not give us the power to force genius down to earth, since according to the plan of Providence it only appears when humanity needs it - which we can never know. But we are in a position to considerably improve the type of the good average person and citizen and to educate a robust, manly race that is capable of putting into practice at least a modest part of the good ideas of which we truly have no shortage.

What we still possess in terms of racial value is hardly known and even less appreciated, and so we see this precious commodity being wasted senselessly. Since racial breeding does require some sacrifices for the sake of convenience, people do not like to hear or talk about it. But everything, literally everything in the world, has its price, and nothing great has ever been achieved without a corresponding expenditure of willpower, work and intelligence. Power must be earned, and whoever wants noble men must breed them.

The already touched upon question of racial caste order and formation may become acute in the near future. The shortage of workers in agriculture, which is draining industry of many workers, has already reached such a level that farmers must think about employing colored workers. When this was recently done on a trial basis, it aroused the anger of a major liberal newspaper, which believed that the German people should be spared racial conflicts similar to those raging in America and Africa. On the contrary. A fresh, cheerful racial conflict is very likely to spoil the Michel's

fraternization and the phrase of equality. No opportunity should be missed to lead social democracy onto thin ice. So always bring in the colored servants.

The coolie is a good farm worker, which is the only possible role he can be. If you leave him to his simple way of life - rice food - and his religion, do not give him the right to vote and arrange things so that even the smaller Besiker can keep his coolie, not only would the shortage of people be eliminated, but the East Germans would also be better able to fight the encroaching Slavs. Mixed marriages between whites and colored people should of course not be permitted, and bastards would be treated the same as colored people. So it all depends on the extent to which colored people are imported to create the caste system. But once you have started at the bottom, you no longer need to think about the top either, because racial breeding is much more important there.

It is nonsense to demand that farmers give up cheap labor and leave their fields fallow for the sake of empty theories. If the white proletariat, following the socialist siren, prefers to languish in factories and big cities instead of doing healthy agricultural work, that is its right, and it may thank its superiors for this, who, instead of using their great influence for practical expenditure, are politically slanderous and hide their impotence under fiery speeches.

The upper comrades play a strange role in the social movement. Unburdened by Faustian creative urges, they try to use the power of their lungs to see what they lack in terms of energy. They believe they are pushing and are being pushed. Approaching the great questions of life with the knowledge and outlook on life of mayflies, they do not notice that in the plan of Providence they are only the means of freeing the earth from the far-too-many. They want to lead the proletariat towards golden days and are driving it into the abyss. They want the good and create the evil, or vice versa, depending on how you look at it.

Theories come and go. The hour has also struck for the dogma of equality, and eradicating it will be one of the tasks of the twentieth century. Meanwhile, social development will not stand still, but it will take place under the motto of Dharma.

People will probably remain unequal forever, but one can hope that as a result of the further strengthening of social conscience, in the future the poor will be less poor and the rich less rich.

* * *

I have reached the end of my little work. We have seen that we are ultimately heading for a completely different goal than that promised by the popular liberalism of the nineteenth century, which ignored its limits. If one goes through the leading historians of the last century, from Rotteck to Ranke, one finds no trace of understanding for race. The discovery of this was reserved for the anthropologists who, like Hellwald in his cultural history, first found the courage to unravel the racial problem and gradually delve deeper into it beyond Gobineau.

Today we are in the middle of the movement. We must wait and see where it will lead. Will it remain with theoretical discussions and will it only be used for new doctoral theses? Or will we finally begin to look at theory in practice?

No one knows, but it has always been found that the great social movements were initiated by great theoreticians. Rousseau and the encyclopaedists who leveled everything were followed by the great revolution, the great national writers who celebrated Germanness were followed by the unification of Germany.

Gobineau will also set a precedent, and the teachings of the Indians will also become better known. Interest in these ideas is growing day by day.

But what will the future hold?

People believe they have discovered a historical legend that action is followed by reaction. The eighteenth century was the aristocratic century par excellence, the nineteenth was the plebeian century. So we can assume that our current century will again be an aristocratic one or will prepare for one.

We who believe in the rise of humanity are happy about this. We believe that there is a plan of salvation that exists in the afterlife and is slowly revealing itself to us. In this we read that there must be struggle on earth, that the better is the enemy of the good and

that everyone must take part in the great spiritual struggle with all their strength.

Everyone is welcome who contributes a stone to the building of eternity. But everyone is also obliged to think about what they can do to benefit the world. For the social-aristocratic principle demands it. The one who serves others is the highest, says our master.

And so a wonderful perspective opens before our eyes. He who serves the most is closest to the Absolute. But who serves the most? He who completely renounces egoism, who, as the Brahmins say, renounces the fruits of his activity and puts himself entirely at the service of the whole. Thus the true aristocrat in a literal sense is the saint. Everything else is vanity.

But people can be divided into the following classes according to their aristocratic performance, viewed from above: saints, spiritual teachers (prophets), philosophers, artists, statesmen, generals, scholars, citizens, craftsmen, slaves. Anyone who only thinks of themselves is a born slave, but anyone who wants to make the largest possible mass happy - be he a king or a theoretician - is a born ruler. For the Stoics already said: Only the wise are kings.

But human society must strive to realize the ideal that those born rulers actually come to power - and so the scales of worldly justice are constantly swaying, with new people who are born rulers (according to Dharma and Karma, like Napoleon I) coming to power and displacing others who have forgotten to "serve".

We cannot determine the laws in detail, we only know that everything is done properly. But we want to emphasize in conclusion that the aristocratic principle must always show itself most clearly in religion, and here it is a Brahmanically spiritualized Christianity with its development into genuine morality and holiness, which will certainly belong to the future.

Everything flows; but one thing remains eternal, that is the highest principle that underlies everything. To reach it is the highest, most aristocratic task. But even a proletarian can solve it if he - after long previous life experiences as Epopt is reborn.

Therefore we should never look down on others with contempt; we do not know how high they may be. For fundamentally the eternal is the same in every soul, one and the same; every soul is - as the Indians say - divine.